The review of this debate is modelled after the adjudication test for Botswana Worlds. How we’ve evaluated this debate is similar to how we expect you to review the Adjudication test debate. It’s also a good model to present your oral adjudication. We do not however expect this level of detail and you will not need to provide speaker by speaker feedback.

The first part of this adjudication will provide an overview of the debate. The second part will be a comparison of the teams and the placing. The third section will provide individual feedback and scores.

Review of the Debate and the Teams

A Brief Overview of the debate

The debate was an average quality with all teams providing clear substantive points advancing their case. However all teams struggled with engagement, and most teams struggled to fulfil their specific team role. Teams were all actively asking Points of Informations.

Review of the Opening Government

The opening government did a relatively good job in presenting a solid case for the model. While the OO were stronger in fulfilling their role and presenting a more coherent attack on the model, the issue OG presented were still very central at the end of the debate such as the best way to increase the number of organs and eliminating the black market. The prioritisation of points could have been improved, it was slightly strange that the issue of bodily autonomy was presented as deputy considering it is the main philosophical underpinning of the government's case. The model could have been articulated better, especially the role of the government in the trade and possibly more explanation regarding the price mechanism. The analysis regarding black market was central throughout the debate and was presented strongly by the prime minister, particularly explaining the risk calculus someone who sells their organ in a black market or government sponsored program. The deputy's material about bodily autonomy lacked some deeper analysis, an analogy such as the one provided by the member i.e. coal mining would have helped. The point regarding raising awareness was not well signposted and it fell out of the debate.

Review of the Opening Opposition

The opening opposition presented a clear position from the start setting out that they accepted the problem with a lack of access to organs and proposing a counter model. While the counter model could have received more explanation from the leader of the opposition (i.e. any exceptions or how it works in certain countries) it did provide a strong counterpoint to the government position. Moreover, the counter model was not responded to at all by the deputy prime minister which meant it stood unanswered until the government members questioned it regarding choice and mutual exclusivity. The attack in the black market took some time to develop, and the analysis backing it up appeared quite late in the deputy's speech with the well used example of prostitution in the Netherlands. The material used to respond to bodily autonomy could have been expanded, although the deputy's response regarding choice and the poor was adequate it was slightly assertive and could have been backed up with more analysis regarding the difficulties the poor may face when assessing their financial position as compared to their health.

Review of the Closing Government

The closing government struggled in presenting a new extension. The first part of the extension relied heavily on material previously used by OG, although the tough stance on choice and the use of miners was a nice addition. The second part of the extension about the benefits to the person selling the organ was to some extent new, but the issues of how to incentivise people to give organs through financial incentives was
exhaustively dealt with in the opening. Finally on the extension, the material was not brought back at all by the whip, thus diminishing its effect. Thus as a team the CG struggled to fulfil that part of its role, in addition to this they did not really engage with the extension of the CO. This lack of engagement, first shows a failure to engage, but it is also a product of extensive material on issues already dealt with in the opening, thus strengthening those teams in the debate.

Review of the Closing Opposition

The CO presented a clear extension which attempted to broaden the debate. While this was done well by the member, the extension had a few problems. First, it relied on a condition that was not necessarily proved, that the debate was mostly concerned about the developing world. The reason provided by CO for this was that because there was a lack of alternatives to organ transplant making accessibility the most important issue was not particularly convincing. This because it had a tendency to fall outside of the debate, the issue of accessibility had already run through the opening half, and the focus on the developing world had been addressed by the deputy leader. Moreover, the whip did not strongly whip the extension, thus there was no attempt at the end of the debate to make the extension appear central. Finally the CO failed to adequately engage in the extension of the CG, this was not determinative as the CG did not responds adequately to the CO it put it out of the top two positions.

Judgement of the Debate

Overview of the Debate

Before discussing specific teams, the adjudicators felt that this debate was an opening half debate. This was because most of the arguments and analysis were presented by the opening teams and those issues remained central throughout the debate. The additions provided by the closing teams did provide some new analysis, however they did not propel the debate forward. Moreover, both closing teams did not adequately engage with the extension provided by their opposing team.

We would have awarded the debate as follows:

- 1st – OO
- 2nd – OG
- 3rd – CG
- 4th – CG

Opening Government

The Opening Government ranks 2nd in this debate. While the OO were stronger in fulfilling their role and presenting a more coherent attack on the model, the issue OG presented were still very central at the end of the debate such as the best way to increase the number of organs and ole of government in raising awareness and providing a solution to the problem. The prioritisation of points could have been improved, it was slightly strange that the issue of bodily autonomy was presented as deputy considering it is the main philosophical underpinning of the government's case. However, this point was one of the stronger issues on the government side and it was better analysed by OG than the CG. The model could have been articulated better, especially the role of the government in the trade and possibly more explanation regarding the price mechanism.

Opening Opposition

Within the first half of the debate we have decided to award the debate to the OO. This was because the OO presented a clear position from the start setting out that they accepted the problem with a lack of
access to organs and proposing a counter model. In contrast the OG failed to engage with this counter model, meaning the OO was able to effectively contrast the two options for change and prove why their opt-out model was best for solving the problem of an organ shortage. While the counter model could have received more explanation from the leader of the opposition (i.e. any exceptions or how it works in certain countries) it did provide a strong counterpoint to the government position. The OO’s material, particularly at deputy provided the deepest analysis regarding the rich poor divide and the ability of a participant in such a program to consent. This material was easily the stronger arguments against the program, thus propelling the OO over the OG. Regarding the black market, while the better analysis was provided in the deputy leader’s speech (such as the prostitution in the Netherlands example) which did not give the OG an opportunity, the OG’s analysis on the issue was relatively poor. This is because the analysis is simplistic, asserting that removing the middle men and providing a market solution was not properly explained either in relation to the model or regarding organ transplants in particular.

**Closing Government**

The fourth position goes to CG. The CG had significant difficulty in presenting a coherent extension. The first part of the extension was not new in that it was based on the material of choice that was dealt with by the deputy prime minister. The extension material relating to the profit motive clearly failed to add to the debate. The focus of the benefit to the seller is not a major area of clash because all teams accepted the profit motive, the issue was whether there was a harm associated with the profit. The greatest failure of the CG was its lack of engagement in the debate overall. As a team they struggled to bring back information that was relevant in the whip speech as well as a failure to engage through offering POI’s and taking POI’s (the whip did not take a POI). The final failure of engagement can be seen in the way the CG failed to engage with the extension of CO.

**Closing Opposition**

The third goes to the CO. The CO fell behind the OG because their extension was not significant enough in the debate. While we acknowledge that they provided new analysis, the best form of the analysis had appeared in the deputy leader of the opposition, and the new material about developing countries as a subset of the debate did not propel the debate forward, or stake a claim to the central issues in the debate which OG had through its argumentation regarding bodily autonomy and black market. Moreover, the CO failed to adequately engage in the extension of the CG, this was not enough to put them fourth because we also though the CG had issues of engagement, although it was a significant shortcoming in comparison to the role OG played in the debate.
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Scorecard – for further explanation see Judges Briefing Score TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OG</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>OO</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Arguments are persuasive and relevant; however model lacked adequate explanation.</td>
<td>LOO</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Arguments always relevant, but not always well analysed. Arguments had tendency to be simplistic or assertive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Arguments persuasive but not always deeply analysed, as well as being peripheral. The speaker was also not strong at engagement.</td>
<td>DLO</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Arguments all relevant, holds a judge’s attention and had strong structure. Positive material was secondary, but rebuttal was very strong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CG</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Arguments relevant but not particularly persuasive. Rebuttal strong, but positive material was at times marginal.</td>
<td>OM</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Arguments are persuasive but not new, and thus speaker had some failures in fulfilling her role. Speaker is quite compelling to listen to and structured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Arguments were simplistic, speaker was not compelling and did not fulfil her own role as a summary speaker, including not taking a POI.</td>
<td>OW</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>The speaker had imperfect structure, and she failed to emphasis and distinguish the extension. However, her material was generally relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

152 | 154

145 | 148

Individual feedback (you will not be required to provide this during the adjudication test)

- **Prime minister** – as noted above the prime minister presented a clear case for implementing the model, particularly on the need for a policy to help those who need organs. The model could have been better explained regarding how it would work. There was, to some extent, a priority issue regarding autonomy which probably should have appeared in this speech. The speaker was quite engaging and was forceful about the points that were the most central. The speaker had very good structure.

- **Deputy prime minister** – the deputy's largest floor was a lack of engagement in the counter model. This could have been more decisive had the closing teams delivered better extensions. The deputy was also a little dismissive at times without really analysing the points, this was best displayed in his response to a decrease of donations by simply saying people donate for different reasons, he could have gone on to use an even if argument possibly accepting a drop but more organs being accessible at a cheaper rate. The material on bodily autonomy was ok, but as noted above could have been bolstered with examples of where the government allows people to make dangerous decisions about their health for money.

- **Leader of the opposition** – the leader's rebuttal was relatively short and should have been more comprehensive. His first rebuttal referring to his positive material could have given some elaboration at that point to make it clear where he was going to deal with it in positive matter. The analysis as noted above could have been stronger, particularly the human dignity point which was too simple – just saying putting a price on an organ puts a price on a body and that undermines dignity is too assertive. The speaker also had a problem answering the second POI questioning a loss of dignity.
where a life is saved. His response attempted to divert the issue to safety which he had not rebutted previously and he never really made an attempt to answer the question.

- **Deputy leader of the opposition** – the deputy spoke very well, she was an engaging speaker to watch, being aggressive at appropriate points while deploying a calm demeanour at other points. However, her speech may have been slightly too fast, she could have attempted to slow down at appropriate points or pause more often. She did a good job hitting back at the OG's lack of response to their model, this highlighted a major role fulfilment failure of the OG. Her analysis regarding the consent in rebuttal was also quite strong noting the inability of certain people to properly understand the risks with such a financial benefit, although an analogy of where government limits such choices would have helped. The greatest flaw of the speech was the positive material was not particularly persuasive. The abuse point was very short, and the black market material rehashed material previously argued. Although, the black market material was strengthened towards the end of the speech with the use of the Netherlands example.

- **Government member** – the member could have spent more time on the extension in an attempt to make it look more central and also in an effort to spend more time distinguishing it from the opening half material. This is particular important for a closing team who, in order to be successful, should highlight the centrality of their extension. Her material on choice was strong, her coal miner example added to the analysis previously presented, she could have attempted to deepen the choice analysis as well. Some of her bluntness undermined her speech, and her comment accepting a reduction in those donating while philosophically consistent with the government's position on choice it was at tension with the OG's comments that the reasons for donating were different and thus it would not change those who donated.

- **Government whip** – the whip's speech was quite weak and did not fit with the role a whip would normally fill. It did not advance any particular issue and effectively summarised the debate but it did not substantiate the cause of the government, or whip the extension. The whip did not look like she was in control of her speech, she struggled through her speech which was not very fluid. Moreover, she did not take a point of information despite a significant number being offered to her. Overall this speech needed to be more structured, and more responsive, both in content and through taking one or two points of information.

- **Opposition member** – the member had a very strong and aggressive speaking style. While at times it borders on dismissive it can be quite an effective tool in attacking the weaker points of the government. The speaker could have spent more time presenting the extension, and should have used that time attempting to show why the debate was really about the developing world. This could have been done by extending her analysis about government regulation in developing countries, that material distinguished the extension from the material of the deputy. Finally, while the rebuttal was long it should have been more targeted, in particular the member lacked an adequate response to the CG's extension The speaker should also be careful not to misrepresent the CG, her opening line questioned the lack of an example from the CG as to when the government allows an individual to make such decisions, where the government member has spoken about mining previously.

- **Opposition whip** – the whip unfortunately followed her member's lead by not targeting her rebuttal appropriately, this was again highlighted by a lack of response to the CG's extension. The whip did an adequate job whipping the extension, and managed to address the broad array of issues at play. However, her broad focus meant that she spent a large amount of time discussing issues that were central to opening teams as opposed to themes that would have advanced the CO in particular. The speaker did do a strong job attacking the affordability issue and attempting to tie it into the extension, however that material played into the OO's material just as strongly.