NPF
FLIP: 10 Sinha - Zhang v. 2 Kanyal - Ramisetty

Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kanyal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ramisetty</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sinha</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro  Con
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF showed tangible effects of OCO's being used to disrupt terrorist organizations while Neg had weak links and unrealistic impacts that were not effectively flowed through the round.

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............... 3 min
Speaker 2 Summary............... 3 min
Grand Crossfire (all)......... 3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus...........2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus...........2 min
3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
**DELGADO, DANIELLE**

**NPF**

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

FLIP: 16 Carter - Braun v. 22 Miller - Ramani

**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Andrew Miller</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Hamley Braun</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Krishna Ramani</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Laura Carr</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**NEG**

---

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

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

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

---

The argument was based on better work of the aff, a more coherent link.

Iran-Saudi conflicts show an imbalance of power. They are taking credit and addressing the issue of Iran. No one wants a war. Iran's economic strength is a key factor in their willingness to engage in negotiations. The aff argues that the goal is not to weaken Iran's economy but to ensure its stability. The neg argues that the economy is already weak and any additional sanctions would further undermine it. The aff counters that these measures are not the root causes of the issue but rather a symptom of the greater geopolitical tensions. The aff stresses the importance of maintaining a peaceful resolution and avoiding escalation. The neg states that the aff's approach would lead to a loss of international support and could exacerbate the situation. The aff responds that a peaceful outcome is possible through dialogue and compromise. The neg believes that the aff's strategy is too soft and that a strong stance is necessary to protect national interests. The aff counters that a strong stance could lead to further deterioration of the situation. The aff concludes by highlighting the need for a balanced approach that addresses the root causes of the conflict.
** novice public forum**

**npf**

**flip: 25 streu - marks v. 22 wang - garcia**

**quarter-finals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Marcj</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>Streu</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro  Con
(Circle winner)

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

**comments & reason for decision:**

**aff:**
- if you're opponent can't answer, you don't have to keep badgering—just bring it up during a speech
- signpost!!!
- 2nd speaker: be more assertive in CX
- need more analysis in rebuttal
- #s aren't everything

**neg:**
- be confident when reading your case & engaging with opponents during cx
- make sure to go straight down the flow instead of jumping around
- need more cards in rebuttal
- make sure you understand why your evidence comes to the conclusion it does

**rfd:** i vote for the affirmative because they are the only team with offensive impacts that are extended throughout the round. in addition, they do better weighing and terminalize their impacts, whereas the negative has abstract concepts for impacts. everyone needs to work on finding clash in the debate and organizing their speeches. overall great job! congratulations on making it this far!
**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

**FLIP: 22 Wang - Garcia v. 2 Kurspahic - Taduri**

**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Nadia Jafar (*10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>A. Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>B. Wang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Very good cases for both sides. Very good organization and evidence.
- Good rebuttal - Angry speech, addressed the key arguments.
- Good job for cross - Really strong rebuttal - Nice job working down the flow.
- Good questions on both sides.
- NEC was not able to fully support IMPA on loss of life.
- Never addressed normalized stats.
# NPF

**FLIP: 12 Coates - Keegan v. 22 Miller - Ramani**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Daniel Bonnichsen (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Erica Keegan 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Michael Coates 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* It was a great round.
* Both the teams performed well.
* I voted "Con" because they were very organised and excellent speakers.
* Pro team please prepare yourself going forward. You guys wasted so much time on finding examples and your cards.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1.................. 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2.................. 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)........ 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3.................. 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4.................. 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)........ 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary....... 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary....... 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)...... 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus..... 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus..... 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.