

Q&A

VEX V5 Robotics Competition 2024-2025: High Stakes

Tagged: SG11

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 High Stakes 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 High Stakes rules questions.

- For event, registration, or other competition support questions, please contact your [REC Foundation 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.

Index

[\[SG11\] \[Q&A 2420\] Teams Removing Own Placed Goal](#)

[\[SG11\]\[SC5\] 50/50 Placed Mobile Goal Status](#)

[Placing, protecting, and pinning: Offense and defense around corner mogos.](#)

[Meaning of "Intentional" With Regards to SG11](#)

[SG11 Mor and Further Clarification](#)

[SG11, Placement, and Stuck Robots](#)

[SG11 - Placement and Removal of One's Own Mobile Goal - Determining Violation Level](#)

[SG11 Clarification](#)

[<SG11> and <G15> interaction](#)

[<SG11> Major or Minor Violation Clarification](#)

[Determining Placed Mobile Goal](#)

[Positive corner](#)

[Momentary Elevation while Crossing Barrier](#)

[Clarification regarding updates to SG11 in Version 3.0](#)

[Elevation Status of a Robot](#)

[Descoring triballs on an opposing elevated robot](#)

[SG11 - Interactions with the short Barrier](#)

[Blocking Maneuvers & Definition of Elevating](#)

[How to consider G14 and G15 when determining a potential SG11 violations](#)

[SG11 part D Clarification](#)

2574: [SG11] [Q&A 2420] Teams Removing Own Placed Goal

24-Feb-2025

SG11

Per [SG11](#), no team can contact a mobile goal placed in the positive corners. At a recent tournament, however, we encountered multiple cases of teams removing a placed mobile goal filled only with their own rings during the endgame (with no competitive advantage gained from doing so). In the game manual, the brief note from [Q&A 2420](#) states: "If the score doesn't change and the Team doesn't benefit, it probably isn't a Major Violation". We ruled that since the teams removed their own placed mobile goal, did not gain any benefit, and the match result did not change as a result of the mobile goal no longer being placed, this would be an SG11 minor violation. However, the bolded text of Q&A 2420 explicitly states that the scored/placed status of the mobile goal should not change.

If an alliance descoring their own placed mobile goal (filled with only their own rings) does not affect the match result and the team gains no competitive advantage, should this be a major or minor SG11 violation?

Answered by committee

As stated in rule [SG11](#), "Robots can remove Mobile Goals that are not Placed and Rings that are not Scored from the Positive Corners of the Field, provided that the interaction does not affect the Placed/Scored status of any protected Mobile Goals or Rings." The rule does not differentiate based on the color of Rings Scored on the Mobile Goal.

Our guidance in Q&A 2420 regarding Violations that are likely Minor applies to situations in which both the Placed/Scored status of a protected object doesn't change *AND* the offending Team doesn't benefit from the offense. That guidance does not apply in this scenario. **Because the interaction you describe has changed the score of the Match, it should be considered a Major Violation even though the offending Team didn't benefit.**

2492: [SG11][SC5] 50/50 Placed Mobile Goal Status

1-Feb-2025

SC5 SG11

Right before the protected period, blue1 is slightly tilting the goal away from their robot in the positive corner on the opposite side of the field in a way that is indeterminable from a head referee and some scorekeeper referee's points of views if the mobile goal is placed but it can be reasonably assumed the goal could be placed. At 30 seconds they drive away and the goal slightly drops from the tilt, causing concern it might have been lifted.

Should a mobile goal always be considered not placed unless confirmed placed similar to [Q&A 2122](#), or should we give benefit of the doubt in the situations that could be considered 50/50 calls?

Answered by 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 determination and ruling must be made by the Head Referee based on the context of the Match.

2474: Placing, protecting, and pinning: Offense and defense around corner mogos.

28-Jan-2025

G15 G16 SG11

Red 1 places a mogo with red rings in the positive corner and then protects it from being stolen by Blue 1. Blue 1 is aggressively attempting to push past or dislodge Red 1 to get to the mogo. With 16 seconds left, Red 1 tries to leave the corner and the mogo, which, so far, has gone back and forth from being placed because of Blue 1 pushing Red 1 into the mogo. Blue 1 begins a pin, since Red 1 is now trying to leave the corner, and the ref begins the count. At 15 seconds, Red 1 is contacting the mogo because of Blue 1's pin, and so the mogo is not placed. Blue 1 holds the pin for a few more seconds, and at 12 seconds left, Blue 1 backs away and Red 1 leaves the corner as a result (having been trying to escape). Red 1 accidentally drags the goal out of the corner because the mogo lip has gotten lodged under the corner of the robot and is dragged out.

A few questions:

Who's playing offense and defense in this situation, and does it matter?

In this particular situation, did Blue 1 do anything wrong by pinning at or past 15 seconds? (Now 30 seconds with the new rule update.)

Would Red 1 be DQed for pulling the goal out? Technically, they weren't changing the status of the mogo since it wasn't palced at 15 sec. It also wasn't intentional. It was match affecting, though.

What if Red 1 hadn't gotten caught on the mogo, and left the corner with 12 seconds left, changing the status from not placed to placed because they were no longer contacting the mogo?

Would Blue 1 be DQed for using Red 1s robot to do something illegal (strategically contacting protected mogos?)

It could be interpreted as a legal and brilliant move by Blue 1 to shut down Red 1's + multiplier by playing offense at the mogo.

It could also be interpreted as Red 1 playing offense by trying to score by placing and protecting a mogo, and Blue 1 was playing defense by taking away their score.

This happend last weekend. The ref ruled that no violation has ocured on either side.

I'm reffing this weekend, and would like to have a guide on sorting out similar situations going forward.

I'd also like to advise my teams in terms of do's and don'ts from the perspective of both sides.

I'm inclined to say that Red 1 should have stayed put after 15 seconds trusting the the ref would know that they were held against their will, but also that the mogo would not be placed. I'm also inclined to say that Blue 1 played well (offense or defense, I'm still not sure), and that if Red didn't like it, they should have protected the goal without touching it. I'm happy to be corrected.

Thanks in advance.

Matt Monahan Coach, 663 Teams Chattanooga, TN

Answered by committee

Please review the [Q&A Usage Guidelines](#) before posting, specifically point 2, "Read and search existing Q&As before posting." We believe the following previously answered post answers your question; if it does not, please feel free to rephrase and re-submit.

[Q&A 2201 - <SG11> and <G15> interaction](#)

2420: Meaning of "Intentional" With Regards to SG11

4-Jan-2025

SG11

The violation notes under Rule [<SG11>](#) state that:

Intentional, strategic, or egregious Violations will be considered Major Violations

We can think of two scenarios of gameplay in which different interpretations of the meaning of "intentional" can be used:

1. A robot drives up to the goal in the corner and clearly attempts to grab the goal once the 15 second buzzer has passed. The **robot seems to willfully violate the rule**, regardless of whether or not it actually removes the goal.
2. A robot drives towards the positive zone with a clear intent of **manipulating other game elements (i.e. grabbing a ring, or taking a goal that is not considered scored in the corner)**, and in the process of doing so, bumps or jostles the goal in the corner slightly by accident. There is an intent to move towards the corner, but not to interact with the goal, so one could determine this to be an intentional violation due to the fact that the **robot intended to drive close to the positive corner after the 15 seconds**.

An example of where scenario 2 became a major violation can be seen in the clip below, where a red robot attempts to grab a red ring near the positive corner and in the process the goal is jostled slightly but is not removed from the corner, nor does it have any impact on the scoring of that goal:

<https://youtube.com/clip/Ugkx0mCDOybwb09hk1PLrNMQJZcpCKwka883?si=5wLVfUnZhCNRUJBZ>

Given that there is no change to the scored status of the goal and that the team has no prior minor violations, are both of the two scenarios above considered an intentional violation of SG11? Or does only one of these fall under that interpretation?

Answered by committee

We'll start by saying that the GDC will not and cannot override a decision made by a Head Referee during an event.

Additionally, we'll remind Teams that Head Referees have a limited perspective of the Field and are not allowed to consult recordings of the Match to inform their decisions. Referees are human, and must make the best decisions possible based on their judgment of what they observed during the Match. In all interactions, Teams should clearly demonstrate that rules are not being broken; some rules have higher risks than others, and rule [<SG11>](#) has a lot of inherent risk when Robots choose to take action near the Positive Corners during the final 15 seconds of a Match.

That said, we encourage Head Referees to put more focus on the final sentence of rule [<SG11>](#), which states "Robots can remove Mobile Goals that are not Placed and Rings that are not Scored from the Positive Corners of the Field, provided that the interaction does not affect the Placed/Scored status of any protected Mobile Goals or Rings." **If the Placed/Scored status of protected objects doesn't change and the offending Team didn't gain any benefit from contact with the Placed/Scored objects, [<SG11>](#) Violations are likely Minor.**

2376: SG11 Mor and Further Clarification

10-Dec-2024

SG11

[<SG11>](#)[<SG11>](#)

I have a question regarding SG11 and how it should be being called by the referees at events. I understand the protection of the positive corners in the last 15 seconds of the match and the restrictions that come with it. The issue that I'm having is that it has been called differently at two different events in very similar situations.

Situation: Blue robot contacted a placed full goal during eliminations. They did not do this in an attempt to score or de-score any goals but it was due to incidental contact. At the first event they were disqualified and Red was given a win. At the second event the same situation happened and the Blue team was issued a minor violation. I understand that this is up to the interpretation of the head referee but some guidance would be appreciated. These events occurred in the same state/region two weeks apart without any major rule changes that would have impacted the call. Guidance from the committee would be much appreciated, specifically as it pertains to elimination matches. This has had tournament effecting results at both events in question. I think the question we need answered is if a team simply contacts a placed goal within the 15 second protection period is it a DQ or minor violation?

Answered by committee

The Violation Notes for [<SG11>](#) state that intentional, strategic, or egregious Violations will be considered Major Violations. Incidental, inconsequential contact does not qualify as "intentional, strategic, or egregious" and should not result in a Major Violation or Disqualification.

2330: SG11, Placement, and Stuck Robots

27-Nov-2024

SC5 SG11

During a game, BLUE1 became stuck on a ring while holding a mobile goal. The robot was inside the positive corner. The mobile goal was also stuck on a ring and was within the volume of the positive corner (they were attempting to place it), but was not touching the ground. They were stuck there for 45 seconds, including the 15 seconds of positive corner protection. Here were the rules questions that arose from this:

1. Was the mobile goal considered in the positive corner since it was not contacting the floor tiles or the tape?
2. Was BLUE1 in violation of SG11 if they did not operate their mobile goal grabbing mechanism to attempt to drop the goal after SG11 takes effect? Would operating the mechanism have made this an SG11 violation?
3. The mobile goal not being placed meant this was not a match affecting violation but if the goal would have been considered placed, it would have been match affecting. Given that this was not match affecting, should this have been a minor violation or a major violation?

Answered by committee

1. Was the mobile goal considered in the positive corner since it was not contacting the floor tiles or the tape?

If the Mobile Goal was not touching the Floor or a white tape line, then that Mobile Goal did not meet all of the criteria to be considered Placed in a Corner. See [<SC5>](#) clause A.

2. Was BLUE1 in violation of SG11 if they did not operate their mobile goal grabbing mechanism to attempt to drop the goal after SG11 takes effect? Would operating the mechanism have made this an SG11 violation?

As described above, the Mobile Goal was not Placed. Because BLUE1 kept the Mobile Goal raised and never dropped it, there was no [<SG11>](#) Violation in this scenario. If BLUE1 had operated their mechanism and dropped the Mobile Goal, resulting in the Mobile Goal becoming Placed in a Positive Corner during the [<SG11>](#) protection period, then BLUE1 would have intentionally violated [<SG11>](#) resulting in a Major Violation and Disqualification for the Match.

3. The mobile goal not being placed meant this was not a match affecting violation but if the goal would have been considered placed, it would have been match affecting. Given that this was not match affecting, should this have been a minor violation or a major violation?

Because there was no Placed Mobile Goal in your scenario, there was no Violation of [<SG11>](#).

2276: SG11 - Placement and Removal of One's Own Mobile Goal - Determining Violation Level

10-Nov-2024

SG11

[<SG11>](#)

Hello, I referenced Q&A [#2179](#) prior to drafting this, and I think it is similar question but slightly different.

In a recent tournament, a match occurred where RED1 placed a Mobile Goal with 4 Scored Rings in one of the positive corners at 14 seconds (they were in the process of placing it prior to the protection, but dropped it right after the timer). Noticing their error, as soon as it was placed and they had briefly backed away, RED1 then approached the stack again and removed it from the corner in an attempt to avoid receiving a Major Violation under SG11.

The match ended with the Mobile Goal stack still on RED1. The Red alliance won the match significantly, with the score of 23-3. As the team was going to win the match regardless, and immediately rectified the situation when noticing their error, per the Violation Notes for [<SG11>](#), it did not seem to be Intentional, strategic, or egregious.

Can you outline whether this should be considered a Minor Violation (as it was not match affecting), or, that any interaction with the positive corner should automatically result in Major Violation and therefore a Disqualification (regardless if the team corrected it prior to the end of the match).

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response!

Answered by committee

As described in the Violation Note for rule [<SG11>](#), if the Head Referee determines that the Violation was intentional, strategic, or egregious it should still be considered a Major Violation that results in a Disqualification. There is no clause in rule [<SG11>](#) that enables Robots to "correct" Violations to avoid penalties.

Teams are responsible for the actions of their Robots at all times, including removing their Robots from the Positive Corners in time to avoid [<SG11>](#) Violations.

2210: SG11 Clarification

21-Oct-2024

SG11

In a V5RC match, how would rule SG11 be applied if Blue1 forces Blue2 to violate the rule by pushing it into contact with a Loaded Mobile Goal in a protected Positive Corner during the last 15 seconds? Would this be considered a violation, and if so, how would it be enforced? SG11 states that [<SG11>](#) So, how can Blue1 be penalized if they don't touch the Rings or the Mobile Goal? Would the answer change if Blue is winning and or Losing? Additional context for the question:

- We understand that [<SG11>](#) prohibits contact with Mobile Goals in Positive Corners during the endgame.
- We're specifically asking about a situation where an alliance forces its own teammate to violate this rule.
- We're unsure if this would be treated differently from an opponent forcing a violation, as addressed in [<G15>](#).
- We'd like clarification on whether this would be considered a violation, and if so, how it would be penalized (e.g., applied to the specific robot, the whole team, or handled differently).

Answered by committee

There is no rule that prevents a Team from forcing their Alliance Partner into a Violation. In this scenario, Blue2 would receive a Minor or Major Violation of [<SG11>](#), based on whether or not the outcome is determined by the Head Referee to be Match Affecting.

2201: <SG11> and <G15> interaction

17-Oct-2024

G15 SG11

With 17 seconds remaining, blue is holding a mobile goal with a robot mechanism above the ground. This goal is above a positive corner but is not yet placed. A red robot now begins a pin on the blue robot.

At 16 seconds left, the blue robot attempts to release the mobile goal but is unable to place it due to the pin, for example the goal is wedged between the robot and a ring on the floor.

At 14 seconds left, red backs away and the goal has not yet been placed, but because blue tried to release it, the goal will inevitably become placed if blue moves away from the corner.

How do [<G15>](#) and [<SG11>](#) interact in this scenario?

Also, does the ruling change if the goal was originally placed in the corner at 17 seconds, but then was removed from the corner at 16 seconds due to the action of the pin, for example by lifting it off the ground so that it is no longer in contact with the floor?

Answered by committee

In the first scenario, the answer comes down to exactly when the pinned blue Robot releases its hold on the Mobile Goal. If the Mobile Goal is released before the final 15 seconds of the Match, the blue Robot should not be penalized if moving away causes the Mobile Goal to fall into a Placed position. The red Robot would likely receive a Minor Violation as described in the Violation Note for [<G15>](#). However, if the blue Robot in this scenario does not release the raised Mobile Goal until after the protected period begins, driving away and causing the Mobile Goal to become Placed would be an intentional and Major Violation of [<SG11>](#).

In the second scenario, because the Mobile Goal was placed at 17 seconds, the blue Robot would not be penalized for driving away and causing the Mobile Goal to return to a Placed position after the pin ends (assuming the red Robot's pinning action caused the blue robot to inadvertently remove the Mobile Goal from the Corner). The red Robot would likely receive a Minor Violation as described in the Violation Note for [<G15>](#).

2179: [<SG11>](#) Major or Minor Violation Clarification

7-Oct-2024

[SG11](#)

[<SG11>](#) [<SG11>](#) [<SG11>](#) protects mobile stakes in the positive corners during the last 15 seconds of a match. The Violation Notes on the rule states that Intentional, strategic, or egregious Violations will be considered Major Violations. During the last 15 seconds of a match, if a team tips over or removes a mobile goal from a protected corner but the score difference is not match affecting, is a major violation still warranted? Can it be assumed that both of these actions would fit the criteria of "intentional" or "strategic" and thus make this a major violation regardless of whether the action was match affecting?

Answered by committee

In every case we can think of*, changing the score of a Protected Mobile Goal by tipping it over or removing it from the Corner will be part of an intentional, strategic, or egregious action. Per the Violation Note for [<SG11>](#), these are automatically Major Violations and should result in a Disqualification. This note applies regardless of whether or not it is a Match Affecting Violation.

*We acknowledge that a Robot could, conceivably, accidentally tip over a precariously Placed Protected Mobile Goal through transitive or incidental contact that could result in the Mobile Goal no longer being Placed. In that and similar possibilities, the Violation probably isn't intentional or strategic. Have we seen it happen, or do we expect to? No.

2122: Determining Placed Mobile Goal

6-Sep-2024

[SG11](#)

The protection provided by rule <SG11> applies to Placed Mobile Goals and Scored Rings. Rule <SC5> specifies that only one Mobile Goal may be considered Placed in each Corner.

If two goals are in a positive corner that is opposite of the alliance drivers station during the last 15 seconds and they want to remove one, can they ask a Scorekeeper which MG is considered placed? Should a Scorekeeper assist all / no teams?

Answered by committee

If a Team cannot determine whether or not a Mobile Goal is Placed in a Protected Corner during a Match, they are allowed to ask the *Head Referee* for an opinion, but the Head Referee might not be able to respond immediately based on the requirements of their role.

If a Head Referee cannot determine which (if any) of multiple Mobile Goals is Placed in a Corner during an <SG11> interaction, they should assume that none of the Mobile Goal are protected. This judgment call can only be made by the Head Referee with guidance from other referees who witnessed the interaction.

2110: Positive corner

25-Aug-2024
SG11

<SG11>

hello. if there were two mobile goals in the positive corners. are both mobile goals protected in the last ten seconds? and where does the second goal have to be to be protected? is touching the lines of the positive corner enough ?

Answered by committee

The protection provided by rule <SG11> applies to Placed Mobile Goals and Scored Rings. Rule <SC5> specifies that only one Mobile Goal may be considered Placed in each Corner. Therefore, only one Mobile Goal may be considered protected in each Positive Corner during the protected period.

1933: Momentary Elevation while Crossing Barrier

5-Feb-2024
SG11

*<SG11> During the last 30 seconds, robots may not contact... Opponent Robots who meet the definition of Elevated.

"Elevated: A robot is considered elevated at the end of the match if they meet the following criteria..."

Thoughts: Elevated is not defined during the match. Therefore SG11 can only protect elevated robots at the end of the match.

I assume this to be an oversight.

Let's assume that Robots can be considered elevated during a match. Then a robot that is crossing the barrier (on their side of the auton neutral lines) to score, and teters on it for a moment, would be considered elevated in that moment. That is a protected state, a state that being contacted in would draw a minor infraction, and said minor infraction should be recorded.

This means that during the last 30 seconds, robots attempting to go over the bar cannot be defended against, because that might result in momentary violations of <SG11>, even though the robots are not attempting to elevate, just to traverse the barrier.

As a referee, this seems challenging to enforce. Should a team interact with an opponent crossing the bar and momentarily meeting the definition of elevated, then one has to consider the effect that had on the match and track the likely number of points impacted by the interaction. Did it result in one triball not being scored or two?

Can you clarify the state of being "elevated" to address both of these concerns? Thanks!

Thanks!

Answered by committee

As you quoted from rule [<SG11>](#) (bold added for emphasis):

<SG11> During the last 30 seconds, robots may not contact ... **Opponent Robots who meet the definition of Elevated.**

Any Robot that meets the conditions of points 1-4 of the definition of Elevated (contacting only required/allowed items, and not contacting disallowed items) gains the protection of rule [<SG11>](#) during the final 30 seconds of the Match.

If a Robot is crossing their own Barrier while moving Triballs and not trying to Elevate, the Head Referee is unlikely to consider contact with that Robot as a Match Affecting Violation of [<SG11>](#) and that specific contact will likely result in a Minor Violation; however, the final determination must be made by the Head Referee within the larger context of the Match. For the purposes of this rule, Match Affecting calculations should be based on points earned for Elevation, and not for Triballs.

1920: Clarification regarding updates to SG11 in Version 3.0

1-Feb-2024

SG11

SG11 Elevation is Protected was updated to reduce protected period of short barrier to 15 seconds, and contact with elevated opponent elevation bars, elevated robots, and robots in contact with elevation bars remains prohibited in the last 30 seconds . [<SG11>](#)

However the red clarification box still mentions indirect contact with adjacent barriers could be a violation, but does not distinguish between the time period from 0:30 to 0:15, and 0:15 to 0:00.

The intent of this rule is to prevent potentially damaging defensive interactions with Robots who are in the process of Elevating. Indirect contact may also be considered a Minor or Major Violation of G1, G13, or SG11, at the Head Referee's discretion. This could include actions such as: ...

- Repeatedly hitting the Barrier adjacent to the opponent's Elevation Bar ...

How should referees interpret intentional ramming or blocking of the short barriers in the time period from 0:30 to 0:15, since contact is no longer explicitly prohibited? Would one or both of these be considered viable defensive strategies now? Or the intent of the change simply to reduce penalties for incidental contact with short barrier in that time period, and intentional ramming still count as a violation?

Answered by committee

The intent of clause D of rule [<SG11>](#) is to reduce penalties for incidental contact with the short Barrier. As described in the notes and red box for that rule, indirect contact that is part of a potentially damaging defensive interaction--including hitting the Barrier in an indirect attempt to dislodge a Robot that is in the process of Elevating--may be considered a Major Violation at the Head Referee's discretion at any time during the last 30 seconds of the Match.

1875: Elevation Status of a Robot

15-Jan-2024
SG11

I understand the definition of elevated, however we have run into some issues of being elevated but then falling off the bar while they calculate points. So, isn't the robot considered to be elevated if it is not moving and hanging at the end of the match? Or does the robot need to stay elevated the entire time that they calculate up the points. Any information and specific rules you could provide would be greatly appreciated.

Answered by committee

Rule [<SC1>](#) states that "*Scores are calculated once all Triballs, Field Elements, and Robots on the field come to rest*".

If an action occurs after Robots, Triballs, and Field Elements have come to rest, then it is not considered part of the Match and should not impact scoring. If the Robot never comes to rest in the Elevated state before falling, then it will be scored where it comes to rest.

With that being said, in the context of the specific scenario described by this question, it will be difficult for a referee to determine where a Robot "used to be" if it falls before having a chance to be scored. A Team with this design would essentially be waiving any "benefit of the doubt", and should only expect to be scored at a height the Head Referee can confirm with certainty.

For example, if the only thing that they could confirm was that the Robot was a few inches above the horizontal Elevation Bar (i.e. somewhere between Tiers E and G), it would be within their purview to assume Tier E.

1846: Descoring triballs on an opposing elevated robot

29-Dec-2023
SG11

In one of our matches an opposing team interfered with our hang by ramming triballs into us but we still elevated in the end and were the only elevated robot. This meant that the score was not changed by refs. However, 2 triballs were descored since they were contacting our robot despite still being in our offensive zone. This changed the outcome of the match which was 99-100. Should there have been a penalty for pushing triballs into a robot in the process of elevating/elevated?

Answered by committee

First, please see the following red box note in rule [<T1>](#)1:

Note from the VEX GDC: The rules contained in this Game Manual are written to be enforced by human Head Referees. Many rules have "black-and-white" criteria that can be easily checked. However, some rulings will rely on a judgment call from this human Head Referee. In these cases, Head Referees will make their calls based on what they and the Scorekeeper Referees saw, what guidance is provided by their official support materials (the Game Manual and the Q&A), and most crucially, the context of the Match in question. The VEX Robotics Competition does not have video replay, our fields do not have absolute sensors to count scores, and most events do not have the resources for an extensive review conference between each Match. When an ambiguous rule results in a controversial call, there is a natural instinct to wonder what the "right" ruling "should have been," or what the GDC "would have ruled." This is ultimately an irrelevant question; our answer is that when a rule specifies "Head Referee's discretion" (or similar), then the "right" call is the one made by a Head Referee in the moment. The VEX GDC designs games, and writes rules, with this expectation

(constraint) in mind.

We're mentioning this quote because the scenario described by this post is about as "edge case" of a scenario as one can find. Without more explicit direction in the Game Manual or a precedent-setting Q&A, a Head Referee would not have been "wrong" for ruling it either way.

With that being said, we do feel that this scenario warrants a unique combination of [<SG11>](#) and [<G17>](#).

Per SG11, "*Robots may not contact [...] c. Opponent Robots who meet the definition of Elevated*".

G17, in its entirety, reads as follows:

[<G17>](#) Use Triballs to play the game. Triballs 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 [<SG9>](#).)

The intent of this rule is to prohibit Teams from using Triballs 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 Triball and a Robot needs to be scrutinized with the same intensity as if it were a Robot.

Violation Notes: If a rule is Violated through the use of Triballs instead of a Robot mechanism, it should be evaluated as though the rule in question had been Violated by a Robot mechanism.

If the Head Referee determined that the opponent Robots had directly used the Triballs to contact the Elevated Robots, then yes, SG11 has been Violated, since the rule should be evaluated as though the interaction had occurred with a Robot mechanism. And, because this pseudo-SG11 violation was what changed the outcome of the Match, then yes, it would have been considered Match Affecting.

If the Head Referee determined that the contact was incidental or otherwise not a direct attempt to interfere with an Elevated Robot, then the red box in G15 would apply, and it would not be considered an SG11 violation.

1793: SG11 - Interactions with the short Barrier

27-Nov-2023

SG11

Some overlap with this [unanswered question \(as of posting\)](#)

[<SG11>](#) [<SG11>](#) Elevation is protected. During the last 30 seconds of the Match, Robots may not contact the following: a. The opposing Alliance's Elevation Bars b. Opponent Robots who are contacting their Elevation Bars c. Opponent Robots who meet the definition of Elevated d. The Short Barriers adjacent to the opposing Alliance's Elevation Bars

From this the short barrier itself is protected, and elevated robots are protected; no explicit protection is given for non elevated robots contacting solely their short barrier, likewise non influential transitive contact with triballs contacting this bar is potentially not a violation.


Should a robot that is contacting their short barrier be protected?

Should transitive contact be outlawed, this is influential for scoring triballs around elevation bars - potentially allowing locking down triballs.

A robot could be involved in a pushing battle with another bot underneath the elevation bar where neither is contacting a protected component however triballs are in contact with the short barrier Likewise in a similar pushing battle a triball is in contact with the elevation bar is this an sg11 violation?



These are shown in the images below, thus which of these cases should be a violation? Does transitive contact matter as long as it is not indirectly affecting an elevated robot in "a potentially damaging interaction"

image 1: Transitively contacting the barrier image 2: Transitively contacting the elevation bar Image 3: Transitively contacting the elevation bar Image 4: transitively contacting a non elevating/elevated yet protected robot (contacting its



elevation bar)





Answered by committee

A robot could be involved in a pushing battle with another bot underneath the elevation bar where neither is contacting a protected component however triballs are in contact with the short barrier Likewise in a similar pushing battle a triball is in contact with the elevation bar is this an sg11 violation?

These are shown in the images below, thus which of these cases should be a violation? Does transitive contact matter as long as it is not indirectly affecting an elevated robot in "a potentially damaging interaction"

Transitive contact is irrelevant, as it is not mentioned in [<SG11>](#) or any other rules pertaining to this subject.

Rule [<G17>](#) would apply in cases where a Robot is specifically using a Triball to violate a rule (as described in the [<G17>](#) Violation note), such as directly using a Triball to affect a Robot that is Elevating or already Elevated.

With that in mind, the interaction shown in your 4th image (where a Robot is in contact with its Elevation Bar) could potentially be considered a Violation of rule [<SG11>](#) through [<G17>](#), and reinforced by [<G14>](#). The other scenarios would require a Head Referee's judgment based on the context of the interaction and Match, and we cannot provide blanket guidance.

Should a robot that is contacting their short barrier be protected?

Should transitive contact be outlawed, this is influential for scoring triballs around elevation bars - potentially allowing locking down triballs.

Please be sure to review the [Q&A Usage Guidelines](#) before posting, specifically note 1, "The Q&A system is for rules clarifications only." Put more pointedly - the Q&A platform is intended to be a communication channel for questions such as "is this interpretation of a rule legal", not a discussion forum for questions such as "I disagree with this rule, can it be changed?" For suggestions or concerns outside of specific and official rules questions, please use the official [VEX Forum](#) or email GDC@vex.com.

1786: Blocking Maneuvers & Definition of Elevating

26-Nov-2023

SG11

As per [<SG11>](#) Elevation is protected. During the last 30 seconds of the Match, Robots may not contact the following:

The opposing Alliance's Elevation Bars Opponent Robots who are contacting their Elevation Bars Opponent Robots who meet the definition of Elevated The Short Barriers adjacent to the opposing Alliance's Elevation Bars. Violation Notes:

Regarding points "a" and "d": If no opponent Robots are in the process of Elevating, then most incidental or momentary contact is unlikely to be Match Affecting, and should only be considered a Minor Violation.

If a Violation results in opponent Robot damage, or otherwise impedes an opponent's Elevation, then it should be assumed that they would have reached the highest possible Elevation Tier when determining Match Affecting implications. The intent of this rule is to prevent potentially damaging defensive interactions with Robots who are in the process of Elevating. Indirect contact may also be considered a Minor or Major Violation of [<G1>](#), [<G13>](#), or [<SG11>](#) at the Head Referee's discretion. This could include actions such as:

After finding additional posts on SG11, we have revised our original questions. It appears that according to this post, <https://www.robotevents.com/VRC/2023-2024/QA/1725>, parking a robot to block your opponent's access to elevation or short barrier is allowed provided they do not contact the elevation bar or short barrier in the process. The blocking robot is also protected from violation if the opponent pushed the robot into the low barrier while trying to elevate. Post <https://www.robotevents.com/VRC/2023-2024/QA/1642> states that "whether a Robot's actions are defensive or offensive is irrelevant to determining whether or not they violated rule".

Which of the following defensive blocking maneuvers would be considered legal:

1. A 4 wheel robot parks itself in the last 35 seconds across the low barrier without making contact to the low barrier once parked.

2. A robot drives up the low barrier and parks itself on the low barrier during the last 30 seconds making constant contact with the low barrier. None of the opponents' robots are in the processing of elevating at the time when the robot parked.
3. 2 opposing robots race towards the elevation bar during the last 30 seconds with constant contact between the 2 robots. The robot attempting to block their opponent is on the inside, closest to the short barrier. When they reached the short barrier, the blocking robot touches the low barrier while the opponent's robot is in contact with the blocking robot.

Our interpretation based on the current rule and posts from the Q&A is that #1 would be permitted without penalty as it does not violate SG11 and cannot be forced into penalty as per G15. Any attempt by the opponents to dislodge the blocking robot would not result in any violations. One side of the elevation would be effectively blocked.

#2 is unclear as it would only incur a minor violation for contacting the low barrier during the last 30 seconds since none of the opponent's robot is in the process of elevating. But would this be considered a repeated minor violation due to constant contact with the low barrier and become a major violation if matching effecting.

For #3, if there was benefit of the doubt we would assume the call would be ruled in favor of the robot attempting to hang. However, it seems there is no benefit of the doubt it when it comes to elevating so it would be in clear favour of any defensive bot blocking access to elevation bar or low barrier as most likely there would be constant contact between 2 battling robots. Any violations of SG11 would be extremely difficult to call as the defending robot would be protected by G15.

Lastly, we would like clarification on the definition of "in the process of elevating". Does the definition of elevating mean when a robot's lifting mechanism actually starts to lift the robot or when a robot is starting the elevation routine, such as raising hanging mechanism or driving to it's elevating position, or really only counts when it also touches the elevation bar.

Thank you.

Answered by committee

We'll address your scenarios in order:

1. Assuming the Robot in your scenario does not contact any of the items made off-limits by the clauses of rule [<SG11>](#) during the final 30 seconds of the Match, there are no rules preventing this, therefore it is legal.
2. The first Violation Note for [<SG11>](#) specifies that (bold added for emphasis), "Regarding points "a" and "d": If no opponent Robots are in the process of Elevating, then most incidental or momentary contact is unlikely to be Match Affecting, and should only be considered a Minor Violation." In your scenario, the contact is neither incidental nor momentary, and would very likely be deemed a Major Violation by the Head Referee. However, the final judgment call and any penalty would have to consider the full context of the Match.
3. In this scenario, the Head Referee's judgment call would have to consider whether or not the contact with the opponent's Short Barrier was incidental or momentary as described in the Violation Note described in scenario 2.

Regarding your request for a clarification of the definition of "in the process of elevating" as used in the first Violation Note of [<SG11>](#): a Robot that is in the process of elevating will *generally* be trying to climb onto the Barrier on their side of the Neutral Zone or be in contact with one of their Elevation Bars. However, this determination can only be made by the Head Referee within the larger context of the Match, and we cannot provide a blanket answer that encompasses all possible situations.

1776: How to consider G14 and G15 when determining a potential SG11 violations

20-Nov-2023

G14 G15 SG11

Hello, At a recent tournament we encountered a situation where there was a robot that disconnected and was unable to move, but happened to be in front of the opposing elevation bars. We determined that going into the 30 second mark the robot was not in violation of [<SG11>](#) until an opposing robot attempting to elevate pushed them into the elevation bar. The

disconnected robot was then preventing them from elevating. We interpreted that because they were pushed into the elevation bar, they would not be penalized as per [<G15>](#). We considered that in Tipping point there was an explicit phrase that said the offensive robot gets the benefit of the doubt supersedes you cannot force an opponent into a penalty, this year that clause is absent so we determined that [<G14>](#) does not supersede G15. Is this the correct interpretation.

If this is the correct interpretation, if a robot were intentionally try to block an opponent's access to their elevation bars, would they be afforded the same protections against being forced into an SG11 violation.

Answered by committee

Your interpretation is correct. As described in rule [<G15>](#), a Robot cannot be forced into a penalty for a Violation of [<SG11>](#).

We believe [our response to Q&A 1725](#) addresses your follow-up question, regarding a Robot that blocks an opponent's access to their Elevation Bars without violating rule [<SG11>](#).

1767: SG11 part D Clarification

13-Nov-2023

SG11

I have been the head referee at a number of central Florida events. The biggest rule violation I have seen for this game is teams accidentally touching the barrier adjacent to Elevation bar in the last 30 seconds of the match. At a competition last Saturday at Apopka HS there were a significant amount of minor violations given out for this rule alone. I believe the way the rule is written is unfairly penalizing teams attempting to play offensively and score triballs. The rule states: [<SG11>](#) Elevation is protected. During the last 30 seconds of the Match, Robots may not contact the following:

a-The opposing Alliance's Elevation Bars b-Opponent Robots who are contacting their Elevation Bars c-Opponent Robots who meet the definition of Elevated **d-The Short Barriers adjacent to the opposing Alliance's Elevation Bars.**

I believe this rule needs immediate clarification. This rule is written to protect teams going for the elevation points at the end of a game, but with the way it is written in part d penalizes teams who touch the adjacent barriers to the opposing Alliance Elevation Bars with NO consideration on where the opposing alliance is on the field. In the last 30 seconds there is likely to be many triballs around those bars so teams playing offensively attempting to score these triballs are being penalized for slightly bumping into this adjacent bar, EVEN IF the opposing alliance is not attempting to elevate. The rule clearly states that robots may NOT contact the short barriers adjacent, but I am looking for clarification on if there is some leeway given out if the opposing alliance is not making any attempt to elevate.

Answered by committee

Please be sure to review the [Q&A Usage Guidelines](#) before posting, specifically note 1, "The Q&A system is for rules clarifications only." Put more pointedly - the Q&A platform is intended to be a communication channel for questions such as "is this interpretation of a rule legal", not a discussion forum for questions such as "I disagree with this rule, can it be changed?" For suggestions or concerns outside of specific and official rules questions, please use the official [VEX Forum](#) or email GDC@vex.com.

The question of leeway for a situation where no Robots are Elevating is addressed by SG11's Violation Note:

Regarding points "a" and "d": If no opponent Robots are in the process of Elevating, then most incidental or momentary contact is unlikely to be Match Affecting, and should only be considered a Minor Violation.