| **Student Name:** Hanna Zhang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This House prefers international climate agreements with fewer parties but strong, binding enforcement over agreements with universal participation but weak or non-existent enforcement |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Nice job making the strategic observation that Opp’s characterisation of these developing nations means they’re sacrificing any climate progress.   * Here, you need to frame why the biggest priority of the debate HAS to be solvency, hence Prop’s winning pathway is more important.   We did a good job flipping Opp’s point on political pressure and scrutiny when a nation has opted into a binding mechanism.   * Point out that pressure for Paris doesn’t work anyways because the climate obligations are self-defined under Paris, so they can simply lower the obligations whenever it conveniences them.   + Then impact it by saying all climate efforts on Opp will be tokenistic.   The point about international pressure being stronger/effective on your side is an important one. Good job sign posting it during your rebuttal. This will be an important opinion to watch as you touch upon it in the later half of your speech.  You have to keep in mind that the opposition could also argue for a big agreement with many actors that is binding. When you limit your side to ‘we are binding’ therefore we are great, that is simply taking reference from Kyoto VS Paris and nothing beyond that.  The argument that ‘you are more likely to have big/wealthy countries participate’ on our side must have a strong focus on what direct incentive they have to participate. The current incentives provided in the speech aren’t tangible enough. They do not reflect how in the mechanism of the agreement, there lies strong enough incentive on your side.  We continue to assert that it’s “binding” without actually providing the mechanistic analysis on how nations will be forced to comply, be mindful that Opp has challenged the reversal of this buy-in when they cannot meet these obligations!   * We keep referencing some kind of “pressure” but not that the pressure would be effective. * We can highlight that these agreements also include a lot of capacity-building, so developing nations receive a lot more assistance in order to meet these obligations.   I appreciate that we’re finally explaining why countries will buy into a binding mechanism:   * But the analysis here still goes back to international scrutiny, without explaining why a vague sense of pressure is effective. * What is the reason to embrace green policies at the expense of their economy?   + We briefly referenced economic efficiency, yes! Tell me why this helps future-proof the economy of these nations, that the green transition is inevitable, and that they stand to receive a LOT of help if they sign on to these binding agreements.   + Here, we should be engaging with Opp’s claim on reversing buy-in due to a rise of nationalistic sentiments.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.15 | | | | | | |