Q&A

VEX V5 Robotics Competition 2026-2027: Override

Otagowane: GG15

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

---

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?

> **Odpowied? 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 they 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.

3013: Do the color of blocks during incidental moments of gameplay matter?

2-Jan-2026
GG14 GG15

Note: This question was revised by the GDC for clarity and readability.

Should the color of the blocks involved in incidents that require the ruling of a head referee be irrelevant in most cases?

Regarding a situation where the offensive and defensive robots are not clear, such that the situation is at this point equally incidental, must the color of the relevant scoring elements be brought into consideration to establish a more offensive than defensive robot for a ruling?

Odpowied? committee

> Should the color of the blocks involved in incidents that require the ruling of a head referee be irrelevant in most cases?

Yes. In most cases, the color of Blocks is irrelevant.

> Regarding a situation where the offensive and defensive robots are not clear, such that the situation is at this point equally incidental, must the color of the relevant scoring elements be brought into consideration to establish a more offensive than defensive robot for a ruling?

Block color is one factor that can be considered when a Head Referee must decide which of two Robots is "more defensive." In our opinion, this will almost always be a very minor, or tie-breaker, consideration.

3002: Pushing Robots Around the Field

20-Dec-2025
GG15 GG17

According to rule <GG17>, teams are not allowed to Hold other Robots for more than a 3 count. Does pushing Robots around the field count as Holding, and would it count towards a penalty?

The definition of Holding includes Trapping, Pinning, and Lifting.

Trapping is "Limiting the movement of an opponent Robot to a small or confined area of the Field, approximately the size of one foam field tile or less, without an avenue for escape." This does not apply in this scenario as the pushed Robot would be moving outside of a space approximately the size of one foam tile.

Lifting is "Controlling an opponent's movements by raising or tilting the opponent's Robot off of the foam tiles." This also does not apply, as the Robot getting pushed will just slide across the Floor and not get tilted or raised.

Pinning is the only one left, and it is not as clear whether or not this one counts. It says "Preventing the movement of an opponent Robot through contact with the Field Perimeter, a Field Element, or another Robot." Under the definition of a Field Element is the Field. The Field consists of the Floor. The definition of the Floor includes all the foam tiles. In the case

of pushing, this rule could be interpreted as preventing the individual free will movement of an opponent Robot using [Foam Tiles], which in this case would be considered Pinning.

Even if this is considered Holding, In rule <GG17b>, it says that a way for the Holding count to pause is if "Either Robot has moved at least two (2) feet away (approximately one tile) from the location where the Trapping or Pinning count began." This will be fulfilled when the pushing Robot moves with the pushed Robot more than two feet away from the starting point of contact. So would pushing of any kind (That does not tip a Robot) be completely legal? If not, here are some scenarios that might differ in that answer:

(All these scenarios are different and might change the legality of pushing based on rule <GG15> which states that "Offensive Robots get the "benefit of the doubt.""

Scenario 1: RED1 is trying to score on a goal, when BLUE1 pushes them more than two feet out of the way to stop them

Scenario 2: RED1 is sitting at the end of a goal attempting to prevent the BLUE team from scoring, but BLUE1 pushes RED1 more than two feet away and goes to score.

Scenario 3: RED1 is scoring at a goal, and BLUE1 is coming up to them to push them out of the way. RED2 then pushes BLUE1 more than two feet away to stop them from being defensive and preventing their ally from scoring.

None of these scenarios are match affecting.

What is the legality of these scenarios, what would be the penalty for all of these, and will the rules change to change the previous two answers or not?

> **Odpowied? committee**
>
> There is no rule that prohibits pushing another Robot if the interaction doesn't lead to intentional damage, tipping, or Entanglement (<GG14>) or the definitions of Trapping, Lifting, or Pinning (<GG17>). Pushing a Robot across the foam tiles does not count as Pinning them to those tiles (<G3>).
>
> The gameplay described in all of your scenarios is legal, and none of the Teams should be penalized.
>
> And no, we do not intend to change the rules to make pushing illegal.

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 recieves 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 recieves 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>.

> **Odpowied? 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 descore 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 descore 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

Odpowied? 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.