| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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 work describing this as a collective action problem, good reference to tipping points - you can be more specific in terms of highlighting what this point of no return looks like.  Set-up   * Good work using the examples of what this technology is; on ‘systemic change’ what does this mean? Good work analysing the incentives of these companies - you have to analyse what TYPE of companies these are - is this big tech companies/corporate behemoths, or is it start-ups? This is important for your ability to characterise these as greedy vs not. * We need to unpack what exactly this implementation looks like; will the government price be high or low? POI - conceding it’s high means that access still doesn't exist! * 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   * I’m sorry, but what is the thesis of this argument? You have to TELL the judge this! * Is the issue here adoption, or innovation? Your argument seems to be based on adoption? You haven’t done enough to set up the problem in the argument for me to understand what this mysterious ‘gap’ in the market is - and how government owned patents fix this? * Ok so innovation is necessary to achieve this - what kind of innovation? Does it exist, why does innovation accrue on your side? * 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. What really have you proven at the end of this?   Argument 2   * The thesis here is more innovation; this means you need to first establish what it takes to innovate! 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. With government ownership, the revenue model shifts. Companies can no longer profit from exclusivity. Competition shifts from restricting access to *expanding market share* by offering the most efficient, reliable, and affordable products.   + Your arguments are just impacts, did you prove they occur by the end?   06:09 - we have to ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **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: | 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:  Don’t be so simplistic as to companies are profit-driven - stop and analyse what the structure of the companies that innovate green technology are (you should say these are start-ups) - and how they depend on investment from venture capital/angel investors who - if they don’t get a return, just do not invest - and then this research doesn’t happen.  Set-up   * What do you mean by the ‘government will give them funds to license’? * Limiting license fees - fair; but if this is too high, you don’t solve access. If this is too low, then the harm still remains. * You need to re-characterise, rather than just characterise - try and respond to Shi Qi’s model here in terms of what it is able to achieve/not achieve re - if it’s too high, does access occur? If it’s too low, how do you generate enough revenue to subsidise other firms? * What do you mean by broad patents? How do you prevent hoarding, or trolling or so on?   Rebuttal   * On access - fair; analyse what this process of development looks like! We need to explain very simply what is so difficult about this kind of research, such that patents are a crucial incentive!   + Discoveries are unpredictable, requiring years of research. Many experiments fail, leading to further investment and refinement. Green tech research demands highly specialized expertise from scientists, engineers, and technicians. Attracting and retaining this talent is costly. Companies invest substantial resources with the understanding that many projects will fail.   + Patents allow them to recoup their investment and potentially profit from their innovation. Exclusive rights and potential profits encourages companies to invest in high-risk, long-term research projects. Without this incentive, investment in green tech R&D would likely decline.   Argument 1   * Slows innovation - is this distinct from responses? This is largely repetitive of the responses you made above. The same feedback as above in terms of the analysis needed here applies. * Leverage more against abusive monopolistic practices - for instance, 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 tech accessible.   + The hard work, time, resources and unique genius of the creators of new tech deserve to be protected and rewarded. To not protect it is to enable the theft of property.   06:13    We need to ask POIs! We didn’t ask a SINGLE POI today? | | | | | | |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Why is this true? Don’t make this claim and then leave it - justify it and explain WHY this is true!  Rebuttal   * Innovation - how? You’re saying SQ told me - but what did she say? You need to EXPLAIN how innovation can only occur if there is a sharing of ideas + inventions, so companies can focus on scaling, on cost-efficient application and so on.   + Open access allows for the combination of different technological approaches, potentially leading to breakthroughs that wouldn't be possible in a closed system.   + Competition drives companies to find the most cost-efficient ways to apply the technology in various contexts, benefiting consumers and accelerating adoption.   + Open access allows for faster iteration and improvement of existing technologies.     - For instance, if a company discovers a way to improve the efficiency of a wind turbine, that improvement can be immediately adopted by other manufacturers, leading to rapid advancements across the entire industry.     - Also - private patents often just lead to redundant research efforts. Multiple companies may invest in researching the same technology without knowing what others are doing, wasting valuable resources. Open access eliminates this redundancy, allowing for a more efficient allocation of research and development resources.   + 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. What really have you proven at the end of this?   Substantive at 1:30? You’re DPM in BP! Have you responded to everything in Sarah’s speech?  Morally Unjust   * We start by talking about LDCs, but then pivot to start-ups versus big companies. You need to first establish why big companies do this kind of research - and why start ups get edged out because of patents - and why their research in the CF would be incredibly important. * On LDCs - why do states engage in technology sharing? You assume this just happens, and that presumably a moral responsibility exists, but do you prove incentive to share this technology exists? * Good application of previous lessons!   We need to ask POIs! We didn’t ask a SINGLE POI today?  06:23 | | | | | | |

| **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:  Don’t make this claim as to what you achieve, but then move on immediately. If your first said this all, and it went unchallenged - that’s all good; but if it’s untrue - you need to reinforce this here and now in the opening.  Rebuttal   * On this model - what is the point of reminding us? The strategic implication is missing. You have to EXPLAIN how this means your side is able to co-opt access! You need to re-characterise, rather than just characterise - try and respond to Shi Qi’s model here in terms of what it is able to achieve/not achieve re - if it’s too high, does access occur? If it’s too low, how do you generate enough revenue to subsidise other firms? * Competition - stop and analyse what the structure of the companies that innovate green technology are (you should say these are start-ups) - and how they depend on investment from venture capital/angel investors who - if they don’t get a return, just do not invest - and then this research doesn’t happen.   + You have to explain why there are start-ups compared to what OG claims. * What do you mean by broad patents? How do you prevent hoarding, or trolling or so on? * On the state - if this was true, would they even do it? Would this debate happen? Would you be able to implement the caps on license fees?   Argument 1   * What’s new here? Sarah already runs this argument; either specify what new analysis you’re adding, or run something else! * On access - we need to explain very simply what is so difficult about this kind of research, such that patents are a crucial incentive!   + Discoveries are unpredictable, requiring years of research. Many experiments fail, leading to further investment and refinement.   + Green tech research demands highly specialized expertise from scientists, engineers, and technicians. Attracting and retaining this talent is costly.   + Companies invest substantial resources with the understanding that many projects will fail.   + Patents allow them to recoup their investment and potentially profit from their innovation. Exclusive rights and potential profits encourages companies to invest in high-risk, long-term research projects. Without this incentive, investment in green tech R&D would likely decline. * POI - why is corporate competition the most important/governing incentive?   Leverage more against abusive monopolistic practices - for instance, 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 tech accessible. The hard work, time, resources and unique genius of the creators of new tech deserve to be protected and rewarded. To not protect it is to enable the theft of property.  06:26 - We need to ask POIs! We didn’t ask a SINGLE POI today? | | | | | | |

| **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: | 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:  Why are you ATTACKING OG? Frame this as a clash, or the missing piece of analysis that would resolve the opening half clash - of whether accessibility has to come at the cost of innovation/both sides try to claim both - explain why they can’t with their existing mechanistic gaps - pointing out what these gaps are; and then fill it in; this framing will slot you in the easiest first.  When you are taking down pushes from OG/OO, the responses are superficially fine; but the implication is entirely missing. I don’t know why these responses matter because I don’t know what the role of the analysis is; is economic infrastructure super important? Is the government budget being stretched thin an existential challenge to the lives and livelihoods of people, or even the economy?  Extension - you could have run a vertical, and just filled in all the gaps in opening and could have taken it above them.   * On O/G - fair enough, but this is contingent on the innovation and widespread adoption of green technology as a consequence of this policy; so it’s technically contingent on what OG claims to prove. You’re explaining a potential impact of their argument. * Gemma’s POI is basically asking you to mechanise. Why will it be better than oil and gas? Why does adoption happen?   + Under a private patent system, the most lucrative revenue stream comes from *restricting* access and charging premium prices based on monopoly power. With government ownership, the revenue model shifts. Companies can no longer profit from exclusivity. Competition shifts from restricting access to *expanding market share* by offering the most efficient, reliable, and affordable products. * You need to EXPLAIN how innovation can only occur if there is a sharing of ideas + inventions, so companies can focus on scaling, on cost-efficient application and so on.   + Open access allows for the combination of different technological approaches, potentially leading to breakthroughs that wouldn't be possible in a closed system.   + Competition drives companies to find the most cost-efficient ways to apply the technology in various contexts, benefiting consumers and accelerating adoption.   + Open access allows for faster iteration and improvement of existing technologies.     - For instance, if a company discovers a way to improve the efficiency of a wind turbine, that improvement can be immediately adopted by other manufacturers, leading to rapid advancements across the entire industry.     - Also - private patents often just lead to redundant research efforts. Multiple companies may invest in researching the same technology without knowing what others are doing, wasting valuable resources. Open access eliminates this redundancy, allowing for a more efficient allocation of research and development resources.   Good work asking POIs consistently!  I appreciate the attempt to control the debate, but if you speak as fast as you do/don’t slow down - it hurts this attempt. Demonstrate that you are in control. 06:10 | | | | | | |

| **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: | 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:  What is the structure of this speech? Don’t call them Prop - it’s Government bench!  Good call out! Explain that there is no change they make!   * The company that innovated doesn't get compensated for it. * SQ concedes that the price will be high - so it’s not like start-ups can access it, based on the same logic they provide? * So what is this revenue used for? Some mysterious and vague ‘subsidies’?   Good on CG’s extension! There is literally no mechanisation here. You can also point out it’s contingent on widespread innovation + adoption occurring - so technically it’s just an impact of OG.  Why are we saying patents don’t matter…? We’re on Opp…? We want to say that patents matter for innovation!   * Fair on big companies always succeeding; but doesn’t this technically further entrench their advantages? Or is it that patents are the singular mech for start-ups to succeed? I’m confused. Ok, you do eventually say this - but this doesn’t clear the confusion of the first part of the argument.   + Competition - stop and analyse what the structure of the companies that innovate green technology are (you should say these are start-ups) - and how they depend on investment from venture capital/angel investors who - if they don’t get a return, just do not invest - and then this research doesn’t happen. You have to explain why there are start-ups compared to what Gov claims. * On access - we need to explain very simply what is so difficult about this kind of research, such that patents are a crucial incentive!   + Discoveries are unpredictable, requiring years of research. Many experiments fail, leading to further investment and refinement. Green tech research demands highly specialized expertise from scientists, engineers, and technicians. Attracting and retaining this talent is costly. Companies invest substantial resources with the understanding that many projects will fail. Patents allow them to recoup their investment and potentially profit from their innovation. Exclusive rights and potential profits encourages companies to invest in high-risk, long-term research projects. Without this incentive, investment in green tech R&D would likely decline.   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 tech accessible. The hard work, time, resources and unique genius of the creators of new tech deserve to be protected and rewarded. To not protect it is to enable the theft of property.  06:03  Good work asking POIs consistently! Give me more transitions + strategic upshots integrated. | | | | | | |