<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 6</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1 Summary</th>
<th>Speaker 3 Summary</th>
<th>Speaker 4 Final Focus</th>
<th>Grand Crossfire (all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side.

**Judge's Signature**

**Affiliation/Occupation**

**School**

**Comments & Reason for Decision**

- Did you define the debate in a way that you are convincing about?
- Is there a low point win?
- The winner of this debate was [Pro/Con]

**Pro/Con**

- 29

**Varisty Public Forum**

**Vivian-Chauv* (30)**

**District**

**C212**

- Almost all of the pros points thing through to the end of the debate. We are the pro and we are defining the debate as the historical perspective. Excellent speech from both (and individuals)!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 6</th>
<th>C218</th>
<th>Jacob Cordero (27)</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Smith</th>
<th>Hughes</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 2 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min

The first question is asked by the bait speaker.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

C - Congress will no power

Flip - PRESS

A - Power of people: Democracy

B - Power of masses

C - Congress authority - pull forces from Iraq.

**TRUMP**

- Caucasian, male, 45 years old

- President of the United States

- Candidate for the 2016 American presidency

- Businessman

- Billionaire

- CEO of Trump Organization

- Married to Marla Maples

- Father of barron Trump

- Antagonistic and aggressive

- Lack of transparency

- Insults against women

- Intolerable

- Confederate flags

- African American

- Muslims

- Mexicans

- No small talks with other powers

- Only used Press, Phone, tweets

- USA vs. World

- US Power

- B - Power of masses: PRESS

- People needof a leader

- The press will stop

- Legal

- Judicial

- Re-Signed

- US Military

- Stop

A - Watchdog: Press

- Trump -Barrons

- Trump's power

- Congress will no power

- Compromise

- The U.S. will have no peace

- mushroom cloud

- Nukes
Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point win? **Yes.**

Pro's framework to require all checks mechanisms to work at the same time is abusive. Pro also fail to show why those strikes, despite of high numbers, were too much power.

The winner of this debate was **Zhao** 2nd Place **Patel** 1st Place
## Order/Time Limits of Speeches

- Speaker 1
  - 3 min
- Speaker 2
  - 4 min
- Speaker 3
  - 4 min
- Speaker 4 (1 & 2)
  - 3 min
- Speaker 3 Summary
  - 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary
  - 2 min
- Speaker 1 Summary
  - 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all)
  - 3 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus
  - 2 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus
  - 2 min
- Speaker 2 Final Focus
  - 2 min
- Speaker 1 Final Focus
  - 2 min

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

## Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 6</th>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Order Winner</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time Limits:**
- 4 min
- 3 min

**Judge's Signature:**

**Notes:**
- **Pro:**
  - Is this a low point win?
  - Is this a tie?

**Con:**
- Comments & Reason for Decision:
  - Is a low point win.
  - Is this a tie.
  - No.

**Order Winner:**
- Speaker 1

**Points:**
- 3.70

**Order Winner:**
- Speaker 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPF</th>
<th>Harlan Stork (25)</th>
<th>203</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker 1: 4 min, 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker 2: 3 min, 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crossfire 1 (1st), 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crossfire 2 (2nd), 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crossfire 3 (3rd), 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crossfire 4 (4th), 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all), 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary, 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary, 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus, 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus, 2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Emily Walsh** (Pro). **Logan Goswick** was the Con speaker. **Jennifer Stork** was the Pro speaker. **Mike Lovelace** was the Con speaker.

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Pro:** Great note of speeches kept the language and essay context. You used the specific examples and sources that you needed to make up your argument. You were very surprised but you didn’t write up your sources and examples like we ask. You didn’t write up your sources and examples like we ask the con team.

- **Con:** Your note of speeches was very good. You kept the language and essay context. You used the specific examples and sources that you needed to make up your argument. You were very surprised but you didn’t write up your sources and examples like we ask. You didn’t write up your sources and examples like we ask the con team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pullian</td>
<td>27/20</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karanja</td>
<td>22/30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**
- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

*The first question is asked by the leader speaker.*

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- **Ball:**
  - Clear
  - Well-argued
  - Excellent use of evidence
  - spel final fac on point!""
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 6</th>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>A216</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Iscibena Castillano</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Peraza, C.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schulz, D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min, Speaker 2: 4 min, Speaker 3: 3 min, Speaker 4: 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min, Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Final Focus: 2 min

*The first question is asked by the center speaker.*

**Judge's Signature**

- Autumn Gould

**School/Affiliation/Occupation**

- Doug Schulz

**Comments & Reason for Decision**

- Pro: Could be more clear
- Con: Actively agreed with part of framework, flowed consistently
- Pro: New evidence was brought up in crossfire, leading to...

**Con:**

- New evidence was brought up in crossfire, leading to...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Order/Time Limits of Speeches
- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 5: 2 min
- Speaker 6: 2 min
- Grand Crosstime: 2 min

*The second question is asked by the previous speaker.*

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro**
- Sp1: Good point about USF. Pro Sp2 couldn't rebut.
- Sp2: Good point about defending 5T.
- Sp1: Good point about deciding S.
- Sp2: Good point about deciding S.
- Sp1: Better Civil to each other.
- Sp2: Better Civil to each other.

**Con**
- Sp1: Too much power, US wins.
- Sp2: Too much power, US wins.
- Sp1: Too much power, US wins.
- Sp2: Too much power, US wins.
- Sp1: Too much power, US wins.
- Sp2: Too much power, US wins.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 6</th>
<th>Speaker 1-2</th>
<th>Speaker 3-4</th>
<th>Speaker 5-6</th>
<th>Speaker 7-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>1st: Salamin</td>
<td>2nd: Cardone</td>
<td>1st: Salamin</td>
<td>2nd: Cardone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>(20-30)</th>
<th>(20-30)</th>
<th>(20-30)</th>
<th>(20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 5: 4 min
- Speaker 6: 4 min
- Speaker 7: 4 min
- Speaker 8: 4 min
- Crossfire 1 & 2: 3 min
- Crossfire 3 & 4: 3 min
- Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 3 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 2 min

*The first question is asked by the starter.*

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Pro:**
  - Stronger overall framework
  - Able to make stronger, more general arguments from specific empirical information

- **Con:**
  - NO

**Judge's Signature:**

**Affiliation/Occupation:**

Varisty Public Forum

Cindy Sorrensen ('17)

FLIP: 34 Salamin - Cardone v. 28 Raola - Tandon

C214

Sat 03/03/18 09:30AM

**SWSDIT 2018**
Not every case in history that can't be addressed that way.

Board. By the better speaker:
- The final question is asked.
- 2 minutes of prep time per side.
- Speaker A Final Round 2 min.
- Speaker B Final Round 2 min.
- Conclusions (all) 3 min.
- Speaker A Summary 2 min.
- Speaker B Summary 2 min.
- Conclusions (all) 3 min.
- Speaker A 2 min.
- Speaker B 2 min.
- Conclusions (all) 3 min.

Order of Speakers

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point with circle winner? Con

The winner of this debate was

Con

A206

1st

Shih

30

1st

Sun

30

Round 6

San Diego State University 1 - Navigating - Maroney

VPF: 32 Sun - Shih V. 1 Navigating - Maroney

Fiber, Ethan
Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1: 4 min
Speaker 2: 4 min
Speaker 3: 4 min
Speaker 4: 4 min
Crosstown (1 & 2): 3 min
Crosstown (3 & 4): 3 min
2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The final question is asked by the better speaker of the debate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPF</th>
<th>STACK, JACLYN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLIP: 39 Lu - Sahman v. 42 Durado - Perez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 6</th>
<th>points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahman</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was:** Con

**Judge's Signature:**

**School/Affiliation/Occupation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Summary: 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Summary: 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Final Focus: 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Final Focus: 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The first question is asked by the senior speaker.**

**2 minutes of Prep time per side.**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

I vote for Con: The framework does not affect the framework, AUMF does not affect the framework, AUMF... (handwritten notes)

**I vote for Pro:**

The framework is abhorrent because the AUMF does not affect Americans directly butrather does not affect Americans directly and hurts... (handwritten notes)

---

**Handwritten Notes:**

- Conclusion: Something is wrong because it is morally wrong.
- Context: Something is wrong because it is morally wrong.
VPF
Mike Welsby (*42)

Points
B203
28
21

Speaker
1st
2nd

The winner of this debate was

Osborne

Comments & Reason for Decision:

-Organize your thoughts, speech
-Bring in more evidence into your rebuttal

But: -Some things
-Not mentioned

Osborne: -Sign post in your rebuttal- it'll help you
-Show some arguments you used some evidence into your rebuttal

RFD: Can't wash the offense of the pro- the pro basically had no power and was nothing.
So, pro wins. So, the winner is the pro. It's over. You all dropped everything because I was wrong. We all made mistakes. You all voted for me. My faults, my points about my faults. "President during the last five minutes. You Right won my points about my faults," I said. Let's try something else. At 1:10, we won, and you didn't say that you won.

The AUM is NOT THE SOURCE OF EXCESS POWER. Instead, you let the Nestle. I had you yesterday. This would have won you by predicting that at the Nestle. We had many secrets and some important confidents in Bombay that are lost. This was a national shock. Can you think the outer point by saying this? This is a good point to influence people, which is a good point to be eaten next time.

My co-Pac. This is a good argument for drums and candles, not blackboards. Remember, we've got a point.

Anyhow, let's move on to the AUM. Does it make you use the point of topic. It makes - I don't like this topic because it's a point. Most important topics chosen by the dollars, expressed by the American.

The resolution. It's Pro, works on peace, and can continue. You can have won. Some how. It's obviously. Croci have won. Some how. You can have won. Some how. Writers are cheaper. More interesting. However, you must to make the platform better. More efficient. Better confidents, and wise friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School / Affiliation / Occupation</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judge's Signature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 6</th>
<th>Sat 03/09/18 09:30 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Public Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuitty, Ronan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flip: 42 Shabb - Kama Y. 14 Parau - Ram
Orders of speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>Focus 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>Focus 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>Focus 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>Focus 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Speaker 5</td>
<td>Focus 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Speaker 6</td>
<td>Focus 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Speaker 7</td>
<td>Focus 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Speaker 8</td>
<td>Focus 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Speaker 9</td>
<td>Focus 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Speaker 10</td>
<td>Focus 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Speaker 11</td>
<td>Focus 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Speaker 12</td>
<td>Focus 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Speaker 13</td>
<td>Focus 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Speaker 14</td>
<td>Focus 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Speaker 15</td>
<td>Focus 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Speaker 16</td>
<td>Focus 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point win? (Circle Winner)

Pro

Con

The winner of this debate was

2nd

Anu Bhandara

1st

Akhila Bhandara

Round 6

B204

Sat 03/03/18 09:30AM

Varisty Public Forum

Filp: 14 Chow - Khamara v. 1 Bhandara - Kathiravan

Liu, Jane

VFP

SWSDIR 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 6</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>The winner of this debate was Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anay, Gupta</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A219</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 3 min
- Speaker 4: 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 3 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the starter speaker.*

---

For Pro -

- Ahmad has more negative than positive.
- Understanding that US troops might be removed but the major damage already happened.
- President might not be listening to press but we are going to war they do not ask for public opinion.

For Con -

- Ahmad was more negative than positive.
A lot of misunderstanding on both sides. Under the observation of "to make game strategy back".

In a team, this process is flawed for this.

- Check if your speech.
- Prepare for your speech.

Please use CX to carry misunderstandings soft you will.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brearly College Preceding No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges' Signature:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Affiliation/Occupation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brearly College Preceding No.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Commy</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Findell</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Cooley</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Kobashi</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Varity Public Forum (16)

FLP: 41 Commy - Findell v. 25 Cooley - Kobashi

IOH: 15

2013 SWSDT

GIOVANNOLI, SHANNON
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>B209</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Verna</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Bickey</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was: **No**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*Con Team - clear contentions which in total con team also provided pro side's agreement*

*Con Team hit well on pro side's agreement and wrote more impactful to the debate. I did like the ability through a point. Rickels did this*

*I think it was a solid debate.*

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- Grand Crosfire (all): 3 min
- Crosfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Crosfire (1 & 2): 3 min

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*