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

| **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.]  Good start pointing the blame on corporations, a real-life evidence here referencing patents would go a long way in cementing the problem in the status quo.  On the setup:   * The characterisation of the state vs corporations better belong in argumentation instead, let’s keep the set-up to points on clarity with mech, world-building and strategy.   + If the state was already willing to significantly subsidise green energy, why is there a need to remove corporate ownership? Why can’t they work in tandem then? * Interesting point about transparency. Are they always transparent and accountable though? Is there a preemptive required here? * It doesn’t seem like a good option to go on to explaining the subsidies provided by a nation to its company without mentioning the model clearly. * The model is a bit unclear. How much money is required to licence a patent from the gov? There are things that have come out of millions of dollars of investment - do they have higher licensing prices? If there is a price involved - how is that different from corporations? Do companies that come up with these innovations in the first place get rewarded by the government? * What exactly is the mech for removing patents?   + Are we compensating corporations for their work?   + Is commercial licensing free under state ownership?   + Will the state subsidise green efforts from corporations still so we can still benefit from their innovative work? Or will corporations be entirely excluded from innovative efforts from now on?   On the first argument:   * Try to structure all the different ways in which patent abuse happens.   + E.g. Patent hoarding via over-patenting without mobilising it.   + E.g. Suing competitors by weaponising patent laws. * Well done on the incentive analysis on the state having better incentives than corporations!   + We can be more comparative and explain why profit incentives do not align with maximum accessibility, by doing a comparison of business models.     - I.e. Gatekeeping to maximum profit initiatives brings more money over lower price points that are accessible to the majority. * 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.   + Try to ground it to NASA innovations being publicly distributed. * We need to relate this back to the strategy of handling the climate crisis, and why we need collective action as the only acceptable strategy to contain the problem.   Second Argument:   * The idea that big companies have a chokehold on the industry is relevant, however, how does the prop really compensate them for their investment? Example: Exon that invests billions to come up with a new drilling infrastructure, how is it that they get back the investment if not through patents?   + Is there a way in which R&D becomes better under your side? Example: currently, its difficult for academia and startups to engage with big tech. Under our side, there’s more collaboration between industries, academia, start-ups and innovators. * Can you provide examples of what sort of industries will benefit with this policy? For example: will there be new players in EV? Will it help solar companies to be free from big oil corporation’s suppression? In what ways? * We need to acknowledge the trade-off here, their ownership is pay-off for getting more innovation.   + So focus on your winning framing here, which is that innovation means very little if the general public cannot access the innovation.   Good job offering POIs today!  7.57 - Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |