| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulos |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that all patents on green technology should be  government-owned |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 71 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 8 minutes’ long.]  I like the rhetoric on money being the most important for corporations, but bear in mind that the Opposition does not disagree with this! They’re saying the same profit incentive leads to more innovation.  On innovation:   * Good point about how certain programs will still have investment. Can you provide an example relevant to green tech? Example: chemical engineering to produce eco-friendly fertilizers will always see funding from non-gov sector as well as VCs because of how widespread its usage can be irrespective of who owns it. * Interesting point about brand recognition. You haven’t sufficiently established why it’s super significant, so much that there is no decline in investment.   Good point about how PR and political incentives are aligned towards fighting big corps, however, there is insufficient link with how it helps innovation in general.   * Is it the case that political representatives will push for prioritizing funding for certain technologies (better straws, better lab meat, better fertilizers) as the people demand it? * Are companies going to participate in this wave for better PR? Is that effective enough?   Interesting pushback that there’s still profit incentive to continue innovation in some way without patenting, but the Opposition's statement is still true that you minimise their profit margins.   * So we need a business model comparison here:   + Explain that the innovator will still have a first mover’s advantage and they can flood the market sooner than the government can do anything with their new patent ownership.   + We mentioned brand recognition, well done! Tell me why the brand of saving the climate is crucial for market dominance.     - But it’s not clear why companies have to show altruism in order to achieve this branding.   We are getting sucked into the innovation clash for so long, when that is meant to be Prop’s losing clash. So strategically, focus on why accessibility outweighs innovation.   * Point out that innovation means very little if the general public cannot access the innovation.   The point about how specific countries get bigger due to patent protection is illustrated well, although it severely lacks examples. Keep in mind that the opp side can easily flip it arguing how small start ups that innovate won’t be able to protect their patents too, which is a significant loss and a prevention from them getting bigger.  We should integrate the rebuttals with the clashes, because there’s a lot of overlap pertaining to innovation.   * Good job reinforcing state incentives. Try to ground it to NASA innovations being publicly distributed, such as microchip technology which became essential for every modern device.   + We can be more engaging to Opp’s claim here that the state has more volatile incentives when it comes to funding green initiatives.     - So reinforce the rise of green political capital and the state being firmly pro-climate if they are engaging in this policy. * Can we acknowledge the elephant in the room and explain why the state has the CAPACITY for wide-scale distribution? You’re winning the incentives clash, but not necessarily the capacity clash.   + Opposition has broadly made the claim that the state doesn’t have the resources to achieve this.   Stating that the government will have a fair method of patent allocation/licensing isn’t a mechanistic explanation as to how that is ensured.  On combating bad uses of patents, it will be very helpful if we can structure all the different ways in which patents are abused:   * E.g. Patent hoarding via over-patenting without mobilising it. * E.g. Suing competitors by weaponising patent laws. * E.g. Stealing technology from SMEs and using their power to patent it first.   Avoid all these moments of vocalising your inner monologue on not understanding what your teammate has written!  Good job offering POIs today. We can afford to offer more.  8.12 - Good timing! | | | | | | |