| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **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.]  At least we have a hook today, Steph, but try to stay away from conventional “Imagine a world…” opening lines.   * The start clearly outlines your stance. * The stress on bureaucratic slow-ness is appreciated. * I appreciate the reframing that the main goal is the speed in which we secure innovation, can you say exactly why please?   Structure-wise, counter set-up before rebuttals please! What’s your counterfactual?   * We need to mitigate patent abuse proposed by Prop.   On transparency, it's not clear from the first few rebuttals what the direct response on this issue is. You’ve talked about how corporations make money through patents and in the process they drive innovation. However, you can engage on how governments may really not be very transparent. Also, that gov is slow and may not really understand how to set up the right price for specific patents.   * Is there a counter-model that tackles the inadequacies of a proper model from the gov?   Rather than asserting that the state cannot do it, provide the mechanistic analysis on how resource-intensive the process of creating nationwide distribution chains for green energy vs the scale of financial burden that the state would be under when the climate crisis worsens.  Good use of examples of corporations maximising efficiency and innovation, but surely, this overlaps with your argument! We need to avoid repetition and take down Prop’s premises without referencing your positive case.   * Here, we can insert the strategic framing on why there’s NOTHING to create accessibility towards if the groundbreaking green innovation doesn’t exist to begin with. Point out that the kind of technology needed to solve the climate crisis has not existed yet.   On the first argument:   * While it is understandable that your side believes that bureaucratic processes are slow, it isn’t clear in what ways that is the case. Consider questioning if the gov understands the sophistication of patents in general, has a good perspective on how to determine the right price, or may simply be swayed into licensing important patents for cheap due to corporate lobbying. Does this make big corporations more powerful than the status quo? * When you argue that gov can have grants and subsidies, please keep in mind that the prop can flip this around arguing that patents are super expensive, and governments cannot provide a lot of it so that a start-up can licence them. * I appreciate the reinforcement that the profit incentive is powerful enough to drive more innovation, we need to explain uniquely the role of patents in securing their profit margins.   + E.g. It’s not that they can’t still profit without it, it’s that investors will never put money into a risky venture in which competitors can steal your green innovation as soon as it is released.   After proving green innovation is better on Opp, we need to work on the impact analysis here.   * What do you think are these inventions that have the capacity to fix the climate crisis? What is the scale of investment necessary to make this possible, and why can’t the state invest to the same degree?   + There is some reference to low political capital, but we have to engage with Prop’s context on the rise of green capital among states globally. Why do you think this isn’t enough?     - We’re almost implying that the state won’t do much with the parents, but we haven’t truly characterised their incentives in a way where we ought not trust the state. What are their political incentives and why will they abandon the green demand from voters?   When you argue that it slows down innovation, you can connect it with how it hurts incentive for innovation → hurts green tech entrepreneurs/innovators → hurts environment.  Please offer more POIs today!  8.11 - Good timing! | | | | | | |