

Package B + C FAQs

Package C

Why is there an 8.5 meter outer boundary?

We had a lot of feedback on our Package C survey and it was clear that 9m was favored over 7.5m. Choosing 8.5 for package C does not mean that 8.5 is necessarily better than 9m or more likely to be recommended as a revision. Instead we wanted another datapoint to compare and potentially finetune the distance. We feel like 9m is close to ideal so testing a slight variation can help us confirm or adjust slightly.

Why is no same hand toss in Package C?

Based on the feedback survey, a majority of respondents supported this rule. The majority of the core rules teams felt that this rule promotes fairness - allowing receiver's/observers to better see that a legal toss had occurred and enabling the receiver to react accordingly.

Why didn't you include alternate rules like bounce?

We absolutely think testing more of these significant rule changes is important. That said, with package C we wanted to build on what we had learned so far from packages A and B to combine the best of what's been tested previously with some small tweaks based on the things we learned. That said, we're hoping to test a few more significant/radical rule changes at specific events in order to learn as much as we can about what changes could positively impact the sport.

Why have 100cm no hit zone for all divisions?

Having different sizes for different divisions was always something we fiercely debated internally. At this point, we feel like one size no hit zone across division helps simplify and streamline many aspects.

What is the reasoning behind the changes to the equal serving rule?

Again, the equal serving rule was very popular based on the survey for package C feedback. However, some respondents had good suggestions on tweaks that could make it better. First, was the issue of rotating positions. Under the standard rules this happened every five points. In Package C, we aligned the rotations with the serving order so that now it happens after every two servers finish their turn. This means no rotations mid service. Secondly, in the first iteration we had the person who received last becoming the server. However, this method meant that a player's teammate could be out of the action for a long streak. For instance, if A/B are playing C/D, let's look at the first four point sequence:

- A serves to C
- C serves to A
- C serves to B

- B serves to C

So player D's role is minimized for a long streak and these streaks continue throughout the match. In package C, we've changed this up so that now instead of the last receiver becoming the next server, the new server always starts from the left. With this adjustment the new sequence looks like this:

- A serves to C
- D serves to B
- D serves to A
- B serves to C

This pattern more evenly distributes the roles.

Package B

Why are some rules from package A now in package B?

We found that requiring 3 hits on the first possession of a point added value with very little downside. Feedback around this was almost unanimously positive, so we felt it made sense to keep it. The non-receiver movement also fell into this bucket. For the non-server movement, we felt like this rule moved things in the right direction, but it would be worthwhile to test a variation, allowing the non-server to set up earlier (and that testing this sooner rather than later would be best). From here, we'll have data on two different approaches to help decide which is better or continue fine-tuning if necessary.

Why did you add serving rules that weren't originally part of package B?

The feedback we received was that package A was moving in the right direction but didn't do enough to address the issues around serving. We didn't think there were any great options for modifications to the serve itself that would get the result that we wanted. So rather than make serving more difficult we wanted to test a change to the dynamic of serving - giving equal opportunities to serve regardless of the result. This change promotes a greater team dynamic and requires a more well rounded skill set. Further, limiting service time to 3 seconds is a slight nerf that speeds the game up and pairs well with the modified non-server movement rule. While we still think more needs to be done to correct the imbalance of serve dominance, we're hoping this is where a bigger ball could be the right solution.

Why 9m for the outer boundary?

The majority of feedback around the 7.5m boundary was positive, but expressed wanting it to be slightly bigger. We heard feedback about missing longer rundowns and wanting to be able to hit

the ball harder. There is a certain point where the effort to mark the boundary isn't worth it if the boundary hardly ever influences the game dynamics. However, we've seen that the boundary adds value beyond just promoting rallies - it creates a more professional environment, increases safety, and makes watching matches easier. Depending on what you value, the "right" distance for the boundary will vary (or maybe not exist at all). In general, we think that beyond 9m it's probably not worth the effort to paint a boundary. We also thought that 9m was a big enough increase for it to be noticeably different and allow us to compare the two data points.

What is happening around bigger ball testing?

The availability of bigger balls is prohibitive to testing worldwide. We're doing what we can to test bigger balls in the places that they're available (US and Canada). We don't think a bigger ball is a silver bullet on its own. However, in these tests one of the things we want to see is if a bigger ball allows us to keep the rest of the rule changes simpler while hitting our goals. It's a lot of work to paint the boundary. So we want to see if a bigger ball without a boundary can get the results we want (and if not, we can leverage our data on testing with the standard ball to help determine what sized boundary would make sense, knowing a bigger ball doesn't travel as far). We also wanted to test a simplified approach to an expanded no hit zone. So with the big ball, we're testing a uniform size across all divisions. We're then pairing this with the rules that we've found successful thus far to see how close this gets us and if more is necessary.

Why was _____ rule not tested?

All submitted rule proposals were considered, evaluated against a [rubric](#), and discussed by an experienced group of international players. A rule may not have been included in testing because the committee didn't think it would improve the game, it went against the core values of the game (community vote) or that the consequences were too impactful. Just because it has not been included in the initial tests doesn't mean it won't be tested in the future.

What will be included in package C?

Package C will be based on learnings from the first two packages. We're going to keep what's working, continue to refine things that have potential, and scrap anything that doesn't show promise. Again, if the feedback or data shows us that we're not close to where we want to be we'll evaluate if other rules that weren't initially prioritized should be incorporated into testing.

What is definitely going to be included in the 2026 rules at this point?

Nothing. Any rule changes need to be voted on by NGBs to be adopted. Even if we think we've found the perfect solution it's ultimately up to the member federations to decide. At this point, we would recommend the 3 hits on the first possession and some version of receiver/non-server movement allowed. Beyond that we still need more testing, data, and feedback. Boundaries are not definite. A bigger ball is not definite. Just because we've tested rules in multiple packages does not mean they will make the final cut. Keep playing in events, providing feedback, recording your games, and keeping an open mind. We're getting there!