| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is this opening? Good work identifying as to needing to achieve both outcomes on your side - but the phrasing can be lots cleaner and urgent. We need to spell out the capitalist and corporate greed in the status quo.  Set-up   * We need to unpack what exactly this implementation looks like; will the government price be high or low? The companies can only get this money and continue to innovate if the money being given to the company is high? * Why isn’t it an either-or? You have to tell me why companies accept this, why they continue to produce innovation, why the middle is where this ends up? Why is the direct use of the product sufficient, rather than software sales/licensing as well? Is there no gap between these revenue streams? What happens if competitors produce at lower costs, putting the original company out of business, or at a loss? * What will the money generated be used for? Where will this money go?   + Could we channel it back into research and development of new and improved green technologies? Especially those that aren’t commercially viable?   + Could we subside green technology adoption by consumers and businesses?   Argument 1   * We seem to have forgotten that this is a debate about green technology specifically; the impacting or framing of urgency + need to ensure accessibility is missing. You need to explain why this is the mechanism towards solving the climate crisis!   + Explain how this is what leads to a faster dissemination of green technologies, unrestricted by corporate interests that might prioritize profit maximization over widespread adoption. * On companies and entering; good on need to compete; but explain why the competition shifts in terms of what the most lucrative revenue stream is; they have to make sure their product is more value for money - downward pressure on pricing; which means that access increases.   + Under a private patent system, the most lucrative revenue stream comes from *restricting* access and charging premium prices based on monopoly power. Companies focus on protecting their intellectual property and maximizing profits from exclusive use of their invention.   + With government ownership, the revenue model shifts. Companies can no longer profit from exclusivity. Instead, the most lucrative revenue stream becomes *providing the best value for money.* Competition shifts from restricting access to *expanding market share* by offering the most efficient, reliable, and affordable products or services based on the publicly available technology. * What is the structure of this argument? What is the impact?   06:23  Good work asking POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Clarisse Poon |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is the incentive to innovate? When doing big call-outs, don’t only half do them and then move on - deal with it up front, taking 30 seconds; put it to rest, point out the strategic implication and then move on to the rest of your speech. Point out very simply that research and development is expensive, risky and time-consuming. Without the guarantee of protection, there would be no incentive for those with the resources to innovate to pour money into innovation.  Where is the counter set-up? How does your side make sure technology is accessible? For instance, do we subsidise it? Do we selectively take ground-breaking technology and apply this?  Rebuttal   * Why is it only about new start-ups, and not existing patents? * Good call out on lack of explanation in the model; explain how it is an either-or of either high or low; and they must bite that there is either more innovation, or more accessibility. Explaining this is important - it goes logically prior to the cost being high hence companies not engaging in innovation. You must be comparative and explain how they can’t accommodate by using the fees collected to pass onto the companies.   Argument 1   * Barrier of entry; we need to explain very simply what is so difficult about this kind of research, such that patents are a crucial incentive!   + Innovation is a resource-intensive, high-risk venture; and requires a tremendous amount of resources continuously invested despite any failures in the system.   + Many of these start-ups get their funding through private investors, who fund because they get profit and returns of investment. They stop doing this when there is no return; this mechanistic analysis is needed to show how incentive to innovate isn’t just going away - capacity to is! * Good on anti-trust; explain how where there are real abusive practices occurring, we can take action - but otherwise, this is us overstepping; it is not the duty of private companies to make medicines accessible. The hard work, time, resources and unique genius of the creators of new medicine deserve to be protected and rewarded. To not protect it is to enable the theft of property. * What is the outcome of this argument? What specific premise are you pursuing?   06:25    Good work asking POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Kevin Hu |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is the structure of this speech? Our signposting presents a really convoluted list of things we’ll do, from rebuttals, to extensions, to clashes? Is this what the order of responsibilities of a second speaker - either in WSDC or BP are?  Rebuttal   * We need to spell out what we are responding to! Otherwise we’re just saying pieces of analysis - most judges will not connect the dots for you; specify first what their key contributions are - and then go through all the responsive tests. * Why would they develop new technology further - especially because it continues to get taken away? Why isn’t it an either-or? You have to tell me why companies accept this, why they continue to produce innovation, why the middle is where this ends up? Why is the direct use of the product sufficient, rather than software sales/licensing as well? Is there no gap between these revenue streams? What happens if competitors produce at lower costs, putting the original company out of business, or at a loss? * On companies and entering; good on need to compete; but explain why the competition shifts in terms of what the most lucrative revenue stream is; they have to make sure their product is more value for money - downward pressure on pricing; which means that access increases.   + Under a private patent system, the most lucrative revenue stream comes from *restricting* access and charging premium prices based on monopoly power. Companies focus on protecting their intellectual property and maximizing profits from exclusive use of their invention   + With government ownership, the revenue model shifts. Companies can no longer profit from exclusivity. Instead, the most lucrative revenue stream becomes *providing the best value for money.* Competition shifts from restricting access to *expanding market share* by offering the most efficient, reliable, and affordable products or services based on the publicly available technology.   Argument 1   * Are we giving other companies money? What are we doing? How is this revenue generated from use deployed - how much money even is it? If you want to incentivise innovation - you needed to explain that this money is given to companies, and is significant enough to compare to what is prior; if it is access - then the money is too low. * What did you prove by the end of this argument?   Clashes? Where are they coming from?   * Why are these companies so magnanimous that they continue to innovate? How much money do we give them to incentivise them further?   06:07  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **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: | 70 | | | | | |
| 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:  Phrase the opening with more simplicity + clear call to action; what is the big takeaway I should have? That they didn’t characterise, or that they deserve to lose? Prioritise!  Rebuttal   * Explain what this confusion is; how do we price usage? Is it high, is it low? How much money goes to subsidising these big companies? How is this money generated if they want access which necessitates a lower price? Ask these questions to showcase the gaps here rather than just describing the gaps! * We need to point out what it takes to innovate, and how this cannot be compensated by the state; research and development is expensive, risky and time-consuming. Where it is a resource-intensive, high-risk venture; requires a tremendous amount of resources continuously invested despite any failures in the system - can this be compensated by the state?   + Many of these start-ups get their funding through private investors, who fund because they get profit and returns of investment. They stop doing this when there is no return; this mechanistic analysis is needed to show how incentive to innovate isn’t just going away - capacity to is! * POI - do they care about the environment? Is this true? Why are they so magnanimous? Why do individual scientists' love for the environment mean they work long hours for little pay - analyse the priorities these actors have!   **Where is the counter set-up? How does your side make sure technology is accessible? For instance, do we subsidise it? Do we selectively take ground-breaking technology and apply this? This explanation was needed at first, didn’t come - you need to provide it!**  Argument   * What is the thesis? Don’t take me on a surprise journey, give me a map! * You have to analyse what development and innovation requires; you can’t jump over this! * Why doesn’t lobbying happen in your world? You can’t say anti-trust, wave a wand and now no monopolistic practices or patent hoarding exist! * What did you prove by the end of this?   Argument 2   * You spent less than a minute on this - what did you prove? * Explain how where there are real abusive practices occurring, we can take action - but otherwise, this is us overstepping; it is not the duty of private companies to make medicines accessible. The hard work, time, resources and unique genius of the creators of new medicine deserve to be protected and rewarded. To not protect it is to enable the theft of property.   06:04  Good work asking POIs consistently! | | | | | | |