Very close; in the end Con used less jargon with more convincing evidence.  I foundOdani spoke more fast and used unexplained acronyms. Hays was easier to understand, but I did find the coal leads to green argument more compelling.

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

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

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

I found Odani spoke too fast and used unexplained acronyms. Hays was easier to understand, but I did find the coal leads to green argument more compelling.
### Varsity Public Forum

**FLIP: 5 Saravanam - Sekandari v. 9 Hays - Oldani**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Kyle Henden ('6)</th>
<th>Sat 10/05/19 02:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Oldani</td>
<td>Sekandari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hays</td>
<td>Oldani</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points (25-30)**

- 1st: Oldani 24
- 2nd: Hays 25
- 1st: Sekandari 29
- 2nd: Oldani 26

The winner of this debate was **Oldani**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?** No

---

**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
- Grand Crossfire: 3 min
- Speaker 3 & 4 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Oldani**

- Member states need to see limits in policies
- Housing in Malaysia down prices
- From BRI development
- Investment in BRI will allow China to switch to renewables
- No citation on 2018 China coal production

**Hays**

- Cites Chinese coal plants
- Losing money
- Good argument that where is citation on US not
- Brings tariffs to EU?
- More workers will lead to an increase in housing

---

**Sekandari**

- Coal increase
- Coal dependence in member states
- Coal in China, India
- Strong focus on environmental concerns

**Saravanam**

- Coal discussion
- Coal production
- Job dumping
- 3.5 mil jobs at risk
- Elizabeth green tech needs fossil fuels
to be produced

**Energy Policy**
- Coal Plants are in urban areas which allowed into access to energy
- Not places that dist
I feel that the argument that exporting Chinese coal is better than Japan or S. Korea doesn't mean that China should be bringing dirty coal into the EU.

I feel that the con presented well with the environmental impact and that pro presented well on China leasing money in coal plants and helping to build housing in Malaysia. I feel that the environmental concerns should be dealt with before the EU moves forward.

While there is progress, I feel secondary explained environmental concerns well.
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Vanessa Murillo (*8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 2116</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sat 10/05/19 02:00PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Oldani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **Tie**

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

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

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

---

Sekandari: lots of citations, really made your point.

Oldani: your clear speaking is refreshing.

Great first crossfire! Goes to PRO

Saravanan is very enthusiastic! but you didn't comment on investment risk

Hays: great way to adress Con's arguments.

Trump argument is not believable.

EU, china, US don't have sense

2nd Crossfire was good also. Draw

I think the debate came down to Timeline of going to green energy. I believe the argument was won by PRO because they had multiple arguments.

Also, no one talked about supply of money and how the BRI needs the EU!