

# Jaut?jumi un atbildes

## VEX V5 Robotics Competition 2026-2027: Override

Atz?m?ts: SG6

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)

## Indekss

[SG6 Goal Clarification](#)

[Rule Question - Tipping a Goal with Rings](#)

[SG6 - Removing Rings from opposing Alliance Mobile Goal](#)

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

[Rings on Neutral Mobile Goals are not safe](#)

[LRT - Extra Balls on Edge Goals](#)

[Cubes Leaving the Field by Defense Play](#)

[<SG6> clarifications; there are four points of clarification.](#)

[Clarification of Minor Violations of SG6](#)

[Pins for loading](#)

[Should illegally-loaded scoring objects that become score affecting be scored?](#)

[Incidental Contact with Blocks on the Autonomous Line](#)

[Clarification on SG6b](#)

[Can Red team robot load pins introduced by blue team?](#)

[Loading zone - contact clarification.](#)

[Load multiple pins](#)

[Scoring on Another Team's Mobile Goal with Ladybrown](#)

[SG6 and interacting with the 4 ring stack using intake](#)

[Blocked by a mobile goal](#)

---

## 879: SG6 Goal Clarification

6-Oct-2021

SG6

In Manual Version 2.0: SG6 it states at the beginning of the rule:

**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. Examples of "intentional strategies" could include, but are not limited to:

This makes me believe that the intent of the rule is only for *Alliance Mobile Goals* and not *Neutral Mobile Goals*, but in the examples it says:

*Robot* mechanisms or actions solely intended to "lift off" *Rings* from **Mobile Goal Branches**.

*Robot* mechanisms or actions solely intended to "scoop out" *Rings* from **Mobile Goal Bases**.

"Knocking over" or otherwise forcefully manipulating an *Alliance Mobile Goal* such that *Rings* become removed.

I have 2 questions regarding the wording of SG6:

1. I want to know if the reading that the first two actions apply to *Alliance and Neutral Mobile Goals* or just *Alliance Mobile Goals*?
2. I just want to ask again from [Q&A 802](#) if intentionally tipping a *Neutral Mobile Goal* to remove *Rings* is allowed? The answer was yes from 802, but I just want to see if the answer is still the same?

### Atbild?ja committee

I have 2 questions regarding the wording of SG6:

1. I want to know if the reading that the first two actions apply to *Alliance and Neutral Mobile Goals* or just *Alliance Mobile Goals*?

SG6 is only intended to apply to Alliance Mobile Goals.

2. I just want to ask again from [Q&A 802](#) if intentionally tipping a *Neutral Mobile Goal* to remove *Rings* is allowed? The answer was yes from 802, but I just want to see if the answer is still the same?

Yes, the answer is still the same.

---

## 866: Rule Question - Tipping a Goal with Rings

21-Sep-2021

SG6

Would it be considered legal to tip over a goal (like an enemy home goal) in order to dump out the rings?

The idea would be to tip it over (without obstructing other robots) dumping the rings out then putting the goal back sitting up. So it would only be tipped over for a moment.

### Atbild?ja committee

Please review the [Q&A Usage Guidelines](#) before posting, specifically point 3, "Quote the applicable rule from the latest version of the manual in your question".

Rule SG6 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. \*\*Examples of "intentional strategies" could include, but are not limited to:

- Robot mechanisms or actions solely intended to "lift off" Rings from Mobile Goal Branches.
- Robot mechanisms or actions solely intended to "scoop out" Rings from Mobile Goal Bases.
- **"Knocking over" or otherwise forcefully manipulating an Alliance Mobile Goal such that Rings become removed.**

Minor violations of this rule that do not affect 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.

This would be considered "knocking over" the Alliance Mobile Goal, as well as a strategy generally intended to remove Scored Rings. Therefore, this would not be legal.

---

## 852: SG6 - Removing Rings from opposing Alliance Mobile Goal

21-Aug-2021

SG6

\*\*Current Rule <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. Examples of "intentional strategies" could include, but are not limited to: • Robot mechanisms or actions solely intended to "lift off" Rings from Mobile Goal Branches. • Robot mechanisms or actions solely intended to "scoop out" Rings from Mobile Goal Bases. • **"Knocking over" or otherwise forcefully manipulating an Alliance Mobile Goal such that Rings become removed.**

**Viewed in Tournament** Teams tipped an opposing alliance's balance beam over (which held Alliance Goals with rings on them).

**Question** Regardless of rings falling off the posts or out of the base, is this considered 'forcefully manipulating an Alliance Mobile Goal such that rings can become removed' or simply just removing the opposing alliance's goal from the platform?

### Atbild?ja committee

**Viewed in Tournament** Teams tipped an opposing alliance's balance beam over (which held Alliance Goals with rings on them).

**Question** Regardless of rings falling off the posts or out of the base, is this considered 'forcefully manipulating an Alliance Mobile Goal such that rings can become removed' or simply just removing the opposing alliance's goal from the platform?

First, thank you for quoting the relevant rule in your post, because it is important to note that the verbiage in the rule is slightly different than the verbiage used in the question. The relevant point of SG6 is the following:

Examples of “intentional strategies” could include, but are not limited to:

[...]

- “Knocking over” or otherwise forcefully manipulating an Alliance Mobile Goal **such that Rings become removed**.

With regard to this bullet point example, the question of "were Rings removed from the opposing Alliance Mobile Goal" is a key factor. The rule states "such that Rings become removed", not "such that Rings *can* become removed".

The intent of SG6 is to prohibit Robots from removing Rings from an opposing Alliance Mobile Goal, and to make manipulating an opposing Alliance Mobile Goal a risky endeavour. The intent is not to penalize every interaction involving opposing Alliance Mobile Goals. With this in mind, your hypothetical scenario is a good example of why Match context is important when evaluating these situations.

- Given that the Mobile Goal was Elevated on Platform, it is unlikely that the primary intended strategy was to remove the Rings. The primary intended strategy was more likely to un-Elevate or un-Balance the Platform.
- If Rings were not removed from the Mobile Goal during the interaction, it should be considered a warning for future reference.
- If the interaction did result in Rings being removed from the Mobile Goal, it should be considered a violation of SG6.

---

## 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?

### Atbild?ja 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.

---

## 802: Rings on Neutral Mobile Goals are not safe

10-Jun-2021

SG6

Is it allowable to tip over the mobile goal and descore all the Ringles scored by your opponent? Rule <SG6> states that Rings on the Alliance Mobile Goal are "safe", but it appears that scored Ringles on the neutral goals can be descored. The tall mobile goal is top-heavy once the Ringles are on it, and it is easily tipped over.

**Atbild?ja committee**

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

---

## 766: LRT - Extra Balls on Edge Goals

22-Mar-2021

SG6

A student asked if this ball was scored, and I could not give an answer. With more teams this year putting fields in rooms that hardly fit them, this is happening more and more frequently.

Scored

A Ball status. A Ball is considered Scored in a Goal if it is not touching a Robot of the same color as the Ball and meets all of the following criteria. -The Ball is fully or partially within the outer edge of the Goal. -The Ball is fully below the upper edge of the Goal. -The Ball is not contacting the foam tiles outside of the Goal.

Clarification of what determines "fully or partially within the outer edge of the Goal"

<https://www.robotevents.com/VRC/2020-2021/QA/690>

LRT9

This rule is a modification of the definition of Scored. In a Live Remote Tournament, a Ball may be considered Scored in a Goal if it is still touching a Robot of either Alliance color.

## SG6

Keep Balls in the field. Teams may not intentionally remove Balls from the field. While Balls may accidentally leave the field when attempting to Score, doing so intentionally or repeatedly would be a violation of this rule. Balls that leave the field during Match play, intentionally or unintentionally, will be returned to the field at the location nearest the point at which they exited. Referees will return the Balls to the field when it is deemed safe to do so, at the leisure of the referee.

Minor violations of this rule that do not affect 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.

## S2

Stay inside the field. If a Robot is completely out-of-bounds (outside the playing field), it will be Disabled for the remainder of the Match. Note: The intent is NOT to penalize Robots for having mechanisms that inadvertently cross the field perimeter during normal game play

The image attached meets the definition of Scored due to Q&A 690, meets the modified definition of Scored in LRT9, and follows Q&A 731. SG6 determines if this ball is scored.


The precedent that I believe we have is the following:

1. Turning Point, balls that were caught in the net but behind the field perimeter
2. Tower Takeover, stacks that leaned outside of the volume of the field perimeter.
3. Round Up, rings on posts on the walls
4. Gateway, 1107B putting objects on top of goals
5. Toss Up, big balls on top of chutes
6. Skyrise, cubes on outer posts
7. Turning Point, high caps

My question is the following:

1. **How far out of the volume of the field does a ball have to be for it to be considered out of the field, and needs a Referee to return the ball "to the field at the location nearest the point at which they exited"?**
2. **Is the bounding box for Robots leaving the field (S2) and Balls leaving the field (SG6) different?**

Thank you for your time, and thank you to Brad Lauer and the REC Foundation for helping fix the issue I was experiencing when posting this Q&A.





### Atbild?ja committee

Thank you for the detailed question and quoted rules.

The following "blue box" that is found in the VEX IQ Challenge Game Manual should apply in this scenario. We have replaced the word "Riser" (the VIQC game object) with "Ball", and re-numbered the referenced rules to match the VRC manual.

If a Ball is on its way out of the Field (as determined by the Head Referee), but is deflected back into the field by a Driver, field monitor, ceiling/wall, or other external factor, <SG6> would apply. This Ball should be considered "out of the field" and removed by the Head Referee. If the redirection occurred due to contact with a Driver, it will be at the Head Referee's discretion whether <SG6> or <G9> should apply.

Therefore, the Ball in your attached images would be considered "out of the Field", and would not be considered Scored.

(as a note, the two Game Manuals should generally be considered independent of each other. This is a rare case where we are able to borrow the VIQC verbiage, since it has already been written for this scenario, and it will be added to the VRC Game Manual in the future)

---

## 504: Cubes Leaving the Field by Defense Play

26-Jan-2020

SG6

Earlier you ruled on the question below regarding SG6. Would the same ruling apply to teams playing defense on bots trying to set a stack in the unprotected corner. The scoring robot has the tray verticle or nearly verticle and a bot from the opposing alliance comes and rams them sending cubes off the field. The way they are set up there is nowhere else for the

cubes to go. Would this be considered intentional. They may repeat this couple of times per match.

Cubes leaving the field 248A 1 month ago In Autonomous, often teams put a smaller stack in their goal zones. Once drive control starts they knock over the stack to create a larger stack in driver control, often they do so with disregard for elements leaving the field. Should we see an attempt to keep them in play? If there isn't an attempt to keep them in play, should this strategy receive warnings and with repeated occurrences potentially lead to a DQ?

<SG6> Keep Cubes in the field. Teams may not intentionally remove Cubes from the field. While Cubes may accidentally leave the field when attempting to Score, doing so intentionally or repeatedly would be a violation of this rule.

Answered by Game Design Committee If there isn't an attempt to keep them in play, should this strategy receive warnings and with repeated occurrences potentially lead to a DQ?

This interpretation is correct. The limits for "intentionally" and "repeatedly" in SG6 are at the Head Referee's discretion, given the context of a given Match and/or event. If they observe Teams attempting this strategy, we would advise Head Referees to provide clear warnings regarding this risk.

### Atbild?ja committee

This scenario would be considered a combination of SG6 (which includes "Cubes may accidentally leave the field when attempting to Score" verbiage), and G14, quoted below for reference:

<G14> You can't force an opponent into a penalty. Intentional strategies that cause an opponent to violate a rule are not permitted, and will not result in an infraction on the opposing Alliance. Minor violations of this rule that do not affect 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.

## 3111: <SG6> clarifications; there are four points of clarification.

25-Feb-2026

SG6

<SG6><SC6><SG6> clarifications; there are four points listed here that we are looking for clarification on.

Sometimes when loading a pin, the loader places it in the load zone but then when they release the pin, it shifts away from the beam. This would be considered an improper load. <SG6> b

1. We want to make sure we are informing our students the proper way they should delt with this situation.

It is our thought that the loader should say "Misload" then retrieve the pin and reload it. As per <SG6> f

Our concern is that a ref may think they are in violation of <SG6> e

Our students work hard to try to make sure this does not happen, but accidents are inevitable.

Can the community provide guidance as to what the team loader should do when this situation happens?

2. What should happen if it is loaded as above and before the loader can retrieve the pin a robot takes possession of it.

Should it...

A) Sill be retrieved and reloaded; if so, can the loader retrieve it directly from the robot.

B) Just be released by robot, left unconnected, and not touching a robot at end. This way, making it not score affecting; as to avoid a possible major violation.

C) Other; please clarify the proper actions the team/loader should take.

2a) Is there any “point of no return” where a loader can no longer retrieve an improperly loaded pin? If so, what is the point beyond which it can no longer be retrieved and reloaded?

3. What is the proper way our refs should deal with a misload during an event.

A) Instruct the loader to retrieve and reload it? If so, would it matter if the robot had already interacted with the improperly loaded pin?

B) Warn the team is an improper load and just keep track of the pin until the end of the match then follow the guidelines provided in the game manual to determine what type of violation it is.

C) Just keep track of the pin until the end of the match, then follow the guidelines provided in the game manual to determine what type of violation it is.

D) Other; please clarify the proper actions the Ref should take.

4. What does “retrieve” mean; Simply lift the pin so it is not contacting anything but the loaders hand or does the pin need to clear the field perimeter before being reloaded properly.

### Atbild?ja committee

Once a Scoring Object has been Loaded, it should only be retrieved by the Loader if the Head Referee instructs the Loader to do so.

When a Head Referee sees that a Scoring Object has been introduced improperly, they should immediately instruct the Loader to remove the Scoring Object from the Field. It can then be reintroduced as described in rule [<SG6>](#).

If the improperly Loaded Scoring Object has already been picked up by a Robot, in order to avoid a Major Violation the Driver must avoid scoring points with it. The Head Referee may instruct the Team to eject and retrieve the Scoring Object, or the Team may be allowed to retrieve the Robot and remove all Scoring Objects in the Robot's Possession as outlined in rule [<GG10>](#).

---

## 3026: Clarification of Minor Violations of SG6

8-Jan-2026

SG6

The Violation Notes for rule [<SG6>](#) state that:

It is expected that most Violations of this rule will be accidental. In accidental cases that end up being Score Affecting (i.e., an illegally-Loaded Scoring Object is Connected to another Scoring Object), the first occurrence during a Qualification Match may be treated as a Minor Violation and a “final notice” that any future Violation will result in Disqualification for the Match.

This note, along with the other Violation Notes, cover Violations of this rule that are Score Affecting, repeated, intentional, and/or egregious. However, there is no specific guidance on Violations that do not fit any of the criteria listed above. The first sentence of this note seems to imply that an accidental and non Score Affecting Violation of [<SG6>](#) should still be recorded as a Minor Violation of this rule. According to Figure V-2, a team that commits an accidental and non Score Affecting Violation of [<SG6>](#) in three or more Qualification Matches should be assessed as a Major Violation and a DQ for the Match, since the Violation Notes provide no specific guidance for these kinds of Violations. Is this a correct interpretation of this rule?

If so, which of the following actions below should be considered an accidental and non Score Affecting Violation of this rule?

1. A Team illegally loads a Scoring Object so that it is a small distance away from the Load Zone (< 1"). A Head Referee instructs the Team to reload the Scoring Object and the Team complies, reloading the Scoring Object legally.
2. Same as 1, but the Team does this multiple times during the Match.

3. A Team illegally loads a Scoring Object so that it is a small distance away from the Load Zone (< 1"). A Head Referee instructs the Team to reload the Scoring Object, but the Team does not comply. The illegally loaded Scoring Object is not Score Affecting.
4. Same as 3, but the Team does this multiple times during the Match.
5. A Team legally loads a Scoring Object. After the Loader has released the Scoring Object, they reach back in the field and adjust the position of the Scoring Object. If this is not an <SG6> Violation, would this be a <GG4> Violation?

### Atbild?ja committee

Is this a correct interpretation of this rule?

Yes, although the number of Minor Violations it takes before it becomes Major is up to the event's Head Referee(s); whatever number is used for that rule should be applied consistently to all Teams and Matches at the event.

We'll answer your specific scenario questions below.

1. Can't be Score Affecting because it was removed from the Field. Minor Violation.
2. Can't be Score Affecting because it was removed from the Field in every case. Minor Violation for each occurrence, rolling up to a Major at Head Referee discretion.
3. Because the Team doesn't comply with the Head Referee's request to remove the Scoring Object, this becomes an intentional Violation and a Major Violation plus Disqualification for the Match.
4. Because the Team doesn't comply with the Head Referee's requests to remove the Scoring Object, this becomes an intentional Violation and a Major Violation plus Disqualification for the Match.
5. This is a Violation of <SG6> clause E, and should be treated as an illegal Match Load. The object should be retrieved by the Loader and reloaded.

---

## 3020: Pins for loading

6-Jan-2026

RSC3 SG6

Is it legal for the Loader to hold multiple Pins in one hand or arm and load them one at a time with the other hand granted the other pins are not breaking the plane of the field (SG6), or must the Pins waiting to be loaded remain on the floor at all times?

For Skills matches, do the Pins need to be set up exactly as shown in Figure RSC3-1 (including the color order and not stacked), or can the Loader rearrange or stack them in a different color order before the match starts?

Thank you!

### Atbild?ja committee

There is no requirement that Pins remain on the floor until they're Loaded, and there's no restriction on how many Pins a human Loader may hold at one time.

Driver Stations must begin each Match with the correct number and colors of Pins, but there is no required arrangement of those Pins. The human Loader(s) can rearrange those Pins however they wish within the area of the Driver Station, before and during the Match.

---

## 3001: Should illegally-loaded scoring objects that become score affecting be scored?

20-Dec-2025

SG6

[<SG6>](#)

During a match, a pin was illegally loaded due to being a significant distance (several inches) from the load zone, violating [<SG6b>](#). The pin was *not* retrieved and reintroduced per [<SG6f>](#), and was subsequently used to create a three-color stack so therefore became score affecting. According to the red violation note,

It is expected that most Violations of this rule will be accidental. In accidental cases that end up being Score Affecting (i.e., an illegally-Loaded Scoring Object is Connected to another Scoring Object), the first occurrence during a Qualification Match may be treated as a Minor Violation and a “final notice” that any future Violation will result in Disqualification for the Match.

the team was given a minor violation and final notice, since it was the team's first occurrence.

Now to the part I'm not clear on: should the three-color stack that included the illegally-loaded pin be counted toward the score for the match?

In this case, I made the call that the three-color stack would *not* be counted, understanding that per [<T1>](#) this was the "right" call at the time. After making the call, however, I began to wonder if the three-color stack *should* have been counted, or if possibly only the illegally-loaded pin itself shouldn't have been counted, leaving a two-color stack that *should* have been counted.

### Atbild?ja committee

Thanks for this question! The next game manual update will include the following guidance in a new clause of rule [<SC1>](#). You're correct, though---in the absence of specific guidance, the decision you made at that event was reasonable and correct.

Referees should record counts based on verified scoring statuses evaluated after the Match, using final positions of Scoring Objects, Field Elements, and Robots. Points scored during a Violation should not be deducted from a score, other than scoring which takes place after the Match due to continued Robot movement (see clause b of [<GG12>](#)).

---

## 2984: Incidental Contact with Blocks on the Autonomous Line

10-Dec-2025

SG6 SG7

[<SG7>](#) Don't cross the Autonomous Line, and don't interfere with your opponents' actions. During the Autonomous Period, Robots may not contact foam tiles, Blocks, or Field Elements which are on the opposing Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line. [<R8>](#) Engage with the Autonomous Line at your own risk. Any Robot who engages with Blocks that begin the Match on the Autonomous Line should be aware that opponent Robots may also choose to do the same. Per [<GG12>](#) and [<GG13>](#), Teams are responsible for the actions of their Robots at all times.

We have seen different ways of ruling contact of blocks during the autonomous period and would like further clarification. Below are three scenarios and accompanying videos to clarify the rule.

Scenario 1: A blue alliance's robot, during autonomous, intakes scoring elements in contact with the autonomous line under the long goals, and on their side of the autonomous line. The blue alliance lightly contacts the blocks of the red alliance on the autonomous line, No other violations occur. [Scenario 1 Video](#)

Scenario 2: A blue alliance's robot, during autonomous, intakes scoring elements in contact with the autonomous line under the long goals, and on their side of the autonomous line. The blue alliance strikes contacts the blocks of the red alliance on the autonomous line, knocking the blocks well away from their starting position, No blocks contact red robots or other blocks. No other violations occur. [Scenario 2 Video](#)

Scenario 3: A blue alliance's robot, during autonomous, intakes scoring elements in contact with the autonomous line under the long goals, and on their side of the autonomous line. The blue alliance use a match loading mechanism to gather the blue blocks, but lightly contacts the blocks of the red alliance on the autonomous line, No other violations occur. [Scenario 3 Video](#)

How should a referee rule in each of these instances. Thank you for your time, we look forward to your response.

## Atbild?ja committee

<SG7> d. Blocks that begin the Match in contact with the Autonomous Line are not considered to be on either side, and may be utilized by either Alliance during the Autonomous Period. For the purpose of this rule, all eight Blocks that begin the Match in groups that cross the Autonomous Line are considered to be in contact with the Autonomous Line. See Figure SG-7.

There are no <SG7> Violations in your scenarios, assuming the Robot never contacts the foam tiles on the opposing Alliance's side of the Autonomous Line. The four Blocks (two blue & two red) involved in your scenarios are all considered to be in contact with the Autonomous Line per <SG7> clause D, and may be utilized by either Alliance during the Autonomous Period.

## 2947: Clarification on SG6b


24-Nov-2025

SG6

We have a question regarding <SG6b>, which states: "The Scoring Object must be placed in contact with the VEX IQ beam attached to the Floor." When you say "contact," does this mean that as long as the pin is touching any part of the beam, the requirement is satisfied?

We are considering placing the pin on top of the beam (as shown in our picture), and would like to clarify this rule before we proceed.

Thank you!



## Atbild?ja committee

When you say "contact," does this mean that as long as the pin is touching any part of the beam, the requirement is satisfied?

Yes.

## 2912: Can Red team robot load pins introduced by blue team?

11-Nov-2025

SG6

[<SG6>](#)

Can the red team robot load pins introduced by the blue team at the blue team load zone (and vice versa)?

### Atbild?ja committee

In a Teamwork Match, blue Pins may only be introduced at the blue Load Zone by the human Loader for the blue Team, and red Pins may only be introduced at the red Load Zone by the human Loader for the red Team.

Once a red or blue Pin is introduced as described in rule [<SG6>](#), either Robot can freely interact with it.

---

## 2846: Loading zone - contact clarification.

10-Oct-2025

SG6

[<SG6>](#)

"Contact" is the primary criterion given for loading zone rules. Pins must be introduced contacting the zone. Robots cannot be contacting the zone when pins are introduced. Robots cannot be contacting the pin when introduced.

1. Is it possible to reliably introduce a pin adjacent to the beam which is the loading zone? or to be safe does the pin have to be placed on top of the loading zone beam? We have noticed that often when we try to place a pin adjacent to the loading zone, it vibrates or spins slightly on release and ends up not quite contacting the loading zone by maybe 1mm or less. Is this legal? a violation? or really up to ref discretion?
2. parts of our robot are close to the ground, but just high enough that they can pass over the loading zone without contacting it. Is it permissible to demonstrate this clearance to the judges before a match so we aren't erroneously assigned a violation? or should we assume that if its too close to easily see we will be penalized and we shouldn't do it? In line with this, if our robot has a claw that stretches over the loading zone, but clearly doesn't contact it, is it permissible to place a pin directly into the space between the open claw touching the loading zone, or will judge be unable to see that we didn't in fact touch the claw with the pin on the way down and we should assume that since they can't see, we shouldn't use this strategy? In both cases clarifying our intentions with the judges before a match could be beneficial.

### Atbild?ja committee

Thanks for your questions, Team 14118A.

It is impossible to issue blanket answers to your questions beyond what is written in the Game Manual that encompass all possible situations based on snapshot descriptions of hypothetical actions, Robots, mechanisms, or interactions. These rulings must be made by the Head Referee based on the context of the Match.

The outcomes of the strategies you describe will vary widely based on the perspective of the Head Referee involved, and their understanding and application of the rules. We suggest that Teams talk to the event's Head Referee(s) for guidance before Matches start if they intend to use a strategy that could, based on perspective, be ruled as illegal. Ultimately, each Team must make their own decisions based on the level of risk they're willing to assume.

---

## 2726: Load multiple pins

19-Jul-2025

SG6

[<SG6>](#) SG6 does not specify the number of pin to be imported simultaneously. Can I import multiple pin simultaneously?

### Atbild?ja committee

Clauses B and C of rule [<SG6>](#) require Pins and Beams to be introduced one at a time.

b. The Scoring Object must be placed in contact with the VEX IQ beam attached to the Floor. c. The Loader may only put a Scoring Object into a Load Zone if no other Scoring Objects are in contact with that Load Zone.

In order to fulfill criterion B, multiple Pins that are Loaded simultaneously would all have to be simultaneously placed in contact with the VEX IQ beam attached to the Floor, also known as the Load Zone. This would violate criterion C because each simultaneous Pin placement into the Load Zone would happen while the other Pins are in contact with that Load Zone.

---

## 2621: Scoring on Another Team's Mobile Goal with Ladybrown

12-Mar-2025

G17 SG6

Hello GDC!

Teams more and more have been trying to score on mobile goals that are being held by other teams, sometimes doing this while already in control of a mobile goal.

[<G17>](#) says teams are not allowed to use scoring objects "as gloves", but the red box also says this shouldn't be taken to an extreme.

At what point does scoring on a mobile goal with a lady brown while already in control of a mobile goal become a violation of SG6?

Relevant rules: [<SG6>](#), [<G17>](#)

Thank you for your time! :D

### Atbild?ja committee

At what point does scoring on a mobile goal with a lady brown while already in control of a mobile goal become a violation of SG6?

Please review the [Q&A Usage Guidelines](#) before posting, specifically point 2, "Read and search existing Q&As before posting." We believe our answer to Scenario B in [Q&A 2520](#) addresses your question.

That said, we can expand a little bit on our guidance from that question. Scoring a Ring on a Mobile Goal while in Possession of another Mobile Goal isn't automatically an [<SG6>](#) Violation, but if a Robot continues to hold onto the Ring after it's clearly Scored on the Mobile Goal they risk an [<SG6>](#) Violation if the Robot's actions would then move the 2nd Mobile Goal (and the Robot that's Possessing it) in a preferred direction or prevent the Robot or Mobile Goal from moving.

Any interaction with a Mobile Goal while already in Possession of another Mobile Goal is a dangerous strategy, with an inherent risk that a judgment call by the Head Referee may not be in your favor. To quote a head referee from this season, "If you have a mobile goal, pretend you're the Titanic and other mobile goals on the field are icebergs. If you touch one, it could sink you."

---

## 2594: SG6 and interacting with the 4 ring stack using intake

2-Mar-2025

SG6

Regarding [SG6](#), will a robot be considered violating the possession limit of rings if it has its roller intake mechanisms over the 4 ring stack and intakes all 4 rings from top to bottom as shown in the image, given the robot is only contacting 2 rings at a time.



## Atbild?ja committee

If the Robot intakes one Ring at a time, and is only in Possession of one or two Rings at a time, it is not in Violation of rule [<SG6>](#).

If the Robot intakes all four Rings simultaneously, it is in Possession of all four Rings and is in Violation of rule [<SG6>](#).

---

## 2587: Blocked by a mobile goal

27-Feb-2025

SG6

Due to a recent clarification on the limitations of interacting with a second Mobile Goal while a robot is already in possession of another, we understand that any major movement of the second goal can result in a major violation and disqualification.

Given this, we would like to clarify the following scenario: • A blue robot is in possession of a Mobile Goal with its own rings and positioned in a positive corner. • A second Mobile Goal is behind blue as 2 teams were both trying to get into that positive corner at the same time • The red robot has now driven away leaving the goal it was pushing where it was

Blue cannot move without knocking the second mobile goal out of the corner - which requires a significant change in its position.

Scenario 1 Blue cannot drop its current possession mobile goal either as the second mobile goal is too close and there is no room to drop the one in possession.

In this scenario is alright for the blue robot to clear out if the corner by moving the second mobile goal without a SG6 violation - were they being 'trapped' by a second goal and forced into a foul? does this change if there was intent to no intent for this to happen by red.

Scenario 2 Blue could drop the mobile goal they have in possession and push the other mobile goal away then go back to collect the other one - but this opens up the chance for red to dash in and claim the blue ring stacked mobile goal and take it to a negative corner. Blue might want to add more rings before finally dropping it in the positive corner.

Can blue just drive out and push the second goal as it was blocking it from moving anywhere without committing a SG6 violation, grab a few more blue rings then head back to the positive corner.

[<SC6>](#)

## Atbild?ja committee

In both of your scenarios, to avoid an [<SG6>](#) Violation the blue Robot must drop/release the Possessed Mobile Goal before Plowing or Possessing the 2nd Mobile Goal. If the blue Robot releases its hold on the Possessed Mobile Goal before backing up, it will then be legally Plowing one Mobile Goal while Possessing none and will not be in Violation of [<SG6>](#).