| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  If you want to point out that patents are exploitative, that they are responsible for why climate technology isn’t able to develop and proliferate, let’s do this with more urgency! The key to urgency is concentrated, dense sentences that pack a punch, rather than 2-3 sentences that generally describe a problem.  Set-up   * Buy them off? Does the state have the capacity to do this? Good on how the state will reinvest this revenue generated - who are they funding wrt to research and development? The same big companies, or start-ups or both? Clear on the responsibility of the state as well, but you spend too much time on this - make it clear what the role of the state is and move on!   + 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.   + Will the government’s license price be high or low? This is a critical clarification in terms of your ability to subsidise or reinvest!   Argument 1   * I’m sorry, but what is the thesis of this argument? You have to TELL the judge this! * You need to explain why the incentive to innovate being tied to profit means that the research doesn’t happen in the way that is most needed for the environment/or why more innovation even happens generally. If you want to prove more innovation happens, 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. * 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   * Overall, the principled push is fine - but do smaller nations access it now? Why does the USA want to waive usage for Bangladesh, for reference?   06:19 - give me proper conclusions! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Audrey Lai |
| --- |

| **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:  Make eye contact in your opening please! Excellent characterisation of how the state is actually incapable of doing this.  Set-up   * CF - good first call out. Point out - if the license fee is too high, they don’t solve access. If this is too low, then the harm still remains. * On who achieves breakthroughs - good analysis; 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.   + For the big companies who engage in patent hoarding/trolling/price gouging - explain how other policies exist to tackle them - such as anti-trust. You could take a step further and even defend private companies - 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. * Point out that *innovation* is needed, it isn’t that this technology just exists and adoption/access is the problem. At the stage we are at, innovation matters more.   POI - simplest answer is that this doesn’t happen; why does the US give Bangladesh access?  Rebuttal   * Moral hazard + national interest - link this to the POI, but we need to move beyond this characterisation and assume the state is able to do this and explain why it doesn’t happen. You’re spending too much time on this.   Argument 1 - 4:15 is too late!   * We make a number of useful observations - do this more structurally, by analysing 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. * On equal pay within the state - does this transfer over to the private company? Are we nationalising the company, or is it just the patent on the product/technology gets taken? * We didn’t complete the argument! This is a time management issue.   06:08 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Seryoung Choi |
| --- |

| **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:  Is it ironic? This call-out is very descriptive and indirect - you say they ran a negative case, don’t point out what is negative about it, then say they said you didn’t achieve y, don’t explain what this is either and then move on.  Rebuttal   * I think we need to ask - is innovation the issue, or is it adoption the issue?   + We need to establish how it is both; innovation + making it scalable, as well as making existing technology usable/adopted etc. - and then link patents as what prevents this from happening!   + 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.     - 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. * Don’t get caught up on the politics point! This is largely a wash; people have other more important priorities, as Adrian’s POI points out, but also you have the fiat to do this! The real answer I need is how your side will price these; is it the case that the license price will be high, or low? This is a critical clarification in terms of your ability to subsidise or reinvest!   Argument   * Is this a new claim in the round? Most of the analysis here just compares the state and private companies; and already is in Ryan’s speech! * The first bit of our speech we paid more attention to clarity and were indeed clearer, but this kind of goes away within the argument! * You have to explain how pricing is currently high/it is inaccessible because of patents; monopolistic behaviour and no competition - and then explain how this flips.   + 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.   We need to ask POIs! Let’s do this regularly!  06:02 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Cyrus Yuan |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Fair, but we need to be charitable; assume the state can do this, but make the challenges mechanistic!   * For instance, do they ever explain how license fees will be priced? If it’s too high, does access occur? If it’s too low, how do you generate enough revenue to subsidise products/development etc.?   Rebuttal - please structure this; your responses should be to specific issues/points - which then link to why you win. Think of them as mini clashes!   * Fair on lobby, but please spend more time on phrasing ‘oil lobbying people’ is not usable! Good on unions; the implication needs to be clearer - adoption is difficult for reasons beyond patenting. * On Adrian’s POI - On who achieves breakthroughs - 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. For the big companies who engage in patent hoarding/trolling/price gouging - explain how other policies exist to tackle them - such as anti-trust. You could take a step further and even defend private companies - 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. * Point out that *innovation* is needed, it isn’t that this technology just exists and adoption/access is the problem. At the stage we are at, innovation matters more.   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 - you need to explain why they aren’t greedy; this only works if the companies are characterised as start-ups who are in this for development, rather than big tech who are easily characterised as greedy.  On other countries - excellent response; give me an illustration here in terms of international competition; why would the US give Bangladesh free access? It’s used as an economic tool.  Argument - 30 seconds aren’t enough to run this. This is also largely not new; you could use this to flip Sarah’s argument earlier; you can use second speaker arguments earlier in the speech as a part of responses. Watch Canada v. Poland (2023 Vietnam) - 2nd Prop to see how it gets done.  06:28 - ask POIs! | | | | | | |