| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  On awareness - what implication does this have?  Set-up   * Good work identifying you need to explain who joins; but this needs to go to the level of the specific names of states.   + Is it developed states? Is it developing states? Are they major emitters? Are they minor emitters? I can’t ascertain how significant the impact is without this knowledge.     - Who has the capacity to make these commitments? Whose citizens care?   + What drives countries to take action on the climate? Why do states buy into such agreements/institutions? * You need to explain what kind of changes will be made, and what success looks like? What will these states actually do? How will we determine their commitments? The actual path forward in terms of how this works is still unclear.   Note that it is likely mostly developed nations that join; not the major emitters, but the countries in the middle; and while some developing nations are experiencing rapid emissions growth, developed nations still account for a significant portion of current global emissions. On why developed nations join - it is that citizens in developed nations are increasingly demanding action on climate change. This creates political pressure on governments to join and comply with strong international agreements.  Argument 1: Effectiveness   * Good work marking the transition from Kyoto to Paris - good reference to carbon leakage; you have to explain what the implication of this observation is; is it that they will do nothing? It will be largely a PR push/veneer of change? * You’re telling me some set of countries make changes to their emissions, and this leads to more effectiveness in the resolution towards climate change/action.   + But I haven’t been told which states are changing, what their contribution to emissions in status quo is, how this impacts net emissions?   Argument 2: Domino Effect(?)   * You need to explain why your side is able to get the states that matter, the states that set the rules of the liberal international order; so this is the way in which we get the ball rolling. * Developed nations often hold significant influence within international institutions and set the norms and standards for global governance. Their participation in a strong climate agreement with robust enforcement mechanisms can create a ripple effect, encouraging other nations to follow suit. The EU's Emissions Trading System (ETS) has influenced the development of similar carbon pricing mechanisms in other countries. * Who is a climate leader is actually a big contention between the US and China; climate action (prior to Trump) was grounds for competition in terms of hegemony/who is a leader; it helps states gain soft power.   07:10 - the internal organisation of the second argument was super messy. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **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:  Good opening, good illustration of how urgent a problem is; the implication you spell out needs to be more exclusive; buy-in from the biggest polluters matters more than next to nothing from the smaller polluters; this initial buy-in is what is needed to make long term change occur.  Set-up   * Clear explanation of states who join, what the specific goals are; clear burden. * We need more information; what kind of change are you looking to achieve? How valuable is this change in context of what climate action needs? What does it mean to solve climate change? * You can also ask who can afford to avoid and put off climate action - you need to explain why they can ignore the rising urgency of climate change/the impacts we can physically and literally see; it’s developing states that are geographically positioned in danger zones.   Rebuttal   * Fair on why they don’t; slightly assertive - establish the competing priorities these states have that are more valuable; good on Canada/US lobbying; it’s also that there is an economic race these states are all tied into, and that shapes their willingness. * I think you need to ask what exactly they’re mechanising; and who joins on their side such that they don’t get the change they want; it’s likely middle nations that are already instituting change - what’s the delta here?   Argument 1   * Good on the increasing awareness of citizens; tell me which countries this happens in. The specificity is missing and it creates more questions; are the people of India demanding this change from the Modi/BJP government? * On climate as an area of contest for great power competition - good; showcases how great powers have incentives to pursue this. The issue is, I don’t know what the scale of the action they take is; what is the net amount of change that occurs, compared to Prop?   Argument 2   * Good reference to developing states; good on impact driving desire to be a part of these policies; point out how we literally cannot help them outside of adopting a universal approach. * Explain how there is a free rider problem that this addresses; if only some nations take strong action, others can benefit and put off these harms without making a sacrifice; prolonging buy-in; this in turn disincentives action because you don’t want to be the state that suffers economically. * Countries can also engage in carbon leakage - where emissions-intensive industries relocate to countries with weaker regulations. Most importantly, a universal agreement facilitates technology transfer and capacity building - which means states that cannot contribute are able to eventually.   07:11 | | | | | | |