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

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Opening   * Good job illustrating the status quo. Good diagnosis of the race for monopoly. * I think its extremely important to explain what a gov-owned patent system looks like early on in this debate.   Model   * The details about gov owned patents is largely on the level of principle or patent length, and less about direct accessibility. * Will there be paid licensing? * POI response: “it will be the same price as the current one”. Are you sure this is the right way to go for the prop? Isn’t the entire stance of prop supposed to be built around how it should be different - also in terms of price? This requires fixing.   Substantive   * This argument again focuses on revising the context of how its difficult for renewable/smaller companies to access them. Repetition. * I think you should focus on pragmatic example of how it happens. Example: if there’s a EV company trying to manufacture electric motorbikes that requires a specific form of engine that only big companies (renewable or non renewable own), the gov owned patent will be much more accessible than the status quo. * Your new point about price accessibility contradicts with your response to the POI earlier. * The argument largely misses real world implications. For example: our side reduces the amount required for licensing so that smaller companies can focus more on innovation. On our side, you simply have more efficient hardware development, easier access to market. * Do you think your side reduces the possibility of malpractices from big companies? How so? Example: does your side reduce patent trolling? Does your side produce more green innovation? If yes, then of what kind? What is the current problem with development in solar/wind/hydro etc - how does your side solve that problem? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Han |
| --- |

| **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:    Opening   * I am not sure where the starting is going. I don’t see a clear stance or a link with rebuttals. * Good job flagposting at the start.   Counter-Model   * The idea that gov specifically will give them funds may not be very practical. For example: what if the patent licensing costs 10M - does the gov give that? Wouldn’t a general system of encouragement towards several institutions (gov or non-gov) providing more funding better? * It is quite unclear why the Gov’s model is bad based on your counter-model.   Responses   * Incentive for private actors: The idea here is quite general, i.e. those who have patents have and can practice their right of making money. You need to take a few steps forward. Example:   + how will prop stifle innovation on the end of big companies?   + Aren’t the big companies ones that have maximum innovation still?   + Can we still get billions in R&D investment from them under prop side? * There is still no direct engagement with prop’s concern about coercive methods by big companies. This is left unacknowledged. * The gov has proposed gov owned patents specifically for green tech. What is the link of your arguments with green tech? * Can we argue that this is bad for start-ups themselves? A lot of start-ups make money through licensing their patents - which now goes directly to the gov. * Can we argue that it is principally unfair for the ‘gov’ specifically to own these patents. Like what has the gov done to deserve it? Why is it the recipient of the benefits of lisencing it out to other companies?   Signposting several arguments and not being able to complete them during the speech isnt a great way to go. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **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:  Rebuttals   * Innovation: When you argue patents still exist on your side, it does exist in a different way now. How is it that in this uniquely new model, there is still a large incentive?   + Are you sure there’s no other barriers from innovating? Isn’t it better to concede that this is a barrier, but its good enough of a compromise, and maybe argue why this compromise isn’t that big?   Argument   * LDCs: The context that start ups aren’t able to compete with big companies isn’t unique to the second speech.   + I’m not sure how this is a distinct substantive.   + The tech terms and their evaluation - hoarding, gouging, trolling are already brought up.   + Claiming that colonization was the cause of lack of economic development of LDCs doesn’t have a strongly justified link - this needs to be done better. Do you think this burden is necessary or helpful to your side?     - The big link from colonization to LDCs having the right to easier patent is a big step that requires unique justification. Its missing. * The points after the above ones are more principled points. They are not the best way to go at this point onward. * Can you discuss more on   + How much efficiency you will get in green tech development?   + Which sectors within green tech will be best served? Automobile, synthetic meat, agriculture, etc? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Opening   * Interesting hook. Add something to connect it to your stance.  Good job signposting at the start.   Rebuttals   * There is a hint of confusion while moving from one point to the other. Links are missing in several areas. * The points are revolving around gov funding as a solution. You should spend more time criticising their existing model. * Also how is the status quo or your alternative a good solution, besides the point about gov funding as a one stop solution? Is there a way that gov might be a bad actor when it comes to patents? * An important onion on this point can be: how gov setting prices for developments made by non-gov sector/companies is fair or in any way justifies the large amount of R&D involved.   Substantive   * Innovation: The idea that there is lack of money to innovate isn’t clear. Is this supposed to be about how you need incentive to innovate? * The point that without incentive of patent/licence there won’t be innovation is highly repeated. Can there be new points?   + Can we talk about how on prop there isn’t a clear mechanism for pricing, or even the process of gov acquiring the patents.   + How gov’s model stifles innovation both from startups and from big companies when these institutions focus more on buying patents from the gov as opposed to innovating new tech to earn money through licensing?   + It isn’t just startups, also big companies utilize patent licensing. Why should big companies be benefitted with easier access to patents? | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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:  Opening   * Good start. This adds good clarity to your position in terms of rebuttals. * Good structure at the start. * The speed can be slowed down a little.   Rebuttals   * The point about problem with gov paying companies for patents isn’t justified well. It’s supposed to be a few simple response.   + Firstly, there’s just not enough money to fund for patents - we’re talking about billions.   + Second, it isn’t fair that the gov intervenes everyone someone wants to buy a patent. What if their program fails? What if the innovation is bad?   Substantive   * Monopoly:   + Good analysis so far. Incorporation of examples could make it better.   + Good idea claiming patent as a big barrier to entry.   + When you argue you weaken the oil industry, keep in mind that this applies to big renewable energy companies as well. Vestas, First Solar, Tesla - all of their green patents will also belong to the government. * New companies rising; Good analysis to start this argument with, i.e. new companies have much less barrier to entry and big company’s monopoly goes down, therefore there’s room for more innovation.   + Im not sure what you mean by they have unique machineries that’s already produced. This links with?   + Later, good link with speed and efficiency of innovation.   + There’s a good sense of repetition throughout this argument. Perhaps example-based-analysis would help.   Good job supporting each argument with several sub-points and ensuring that impacts are laid out. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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  Rebuttals   * Releasing info: I’m not sure how info release is happening while the patent is secure. * The idea that big companies can get away with accessing info is quite shallow. If this argument is bought, many things can be easily justified. Example: big companies can steal patents as they’re big.   Extension   * Innovation   + “Apples patents doesn’t earn them much money” - are you sure? Big companies secure patents to earn more money and also be secure. Losing patent rights is actually a big deal. Are you sure you want to run with this line of argument?   + I’m not sure if the idea about ‘disparity of powers within large companies’ has a good link with the case - or at least its not made clear so far. * Gov inefficiency   + Good point. Important one.   + The idea that it slows down access is sensible. What happens because of that? Is there a broader impact? * Companies standing out   + Companies won’t be able to go to the market - this is a sensible point. Good job!   + The idea of inability to innovate for big companies is explained sensibly. Is there an example you can incorporate here?     - Example: Why would Exon now fund new start-ups if the patents in return will go to the gov directly. | | | | | | |