

Rules for the Open Parliamentary Debate

Version 15.1

Contents

Objective	3
A Debate	3
A.1 The motion	3
A.1.1 Formulation	3
A.1.2 Relevance and practical relevance	3
A.1.3 Prior assumptions and modifications	3
A.1.4 Additional information	4
A.2 Participating	4
A.2.1 Speakers	4
A.2.2 Panel and Presidency	4
A.2.3 Addressing	5
A.2.4 Simulation	5
A.3 Course of the debate	6
A.3.1 Order of debate and duration of speeches	6
A.3.2 Opening speech of the government	7
A.3.3 Handling missing or incorrect motions	8
A.3.4 Opening speech of the opposition	8
A.3.5 Extension speeches	9
A.3.6 Non-aligned speeches	9
A.3.7 Closing speeches	9
A.4 Interaction during the debate	9
A.4.1 Means of interaction	9
A.4.2 Reply speeches	10
A.4.3 Questions	10
A.4.4 Interjections	11
B Evaluation	12
B.1 Scale and object of the evaluation	12
B.1.1 Aim of the evaluation	12
B.1.2 Rating according to points	13
B.1.3 Individual performance	13
B.1.4 Team performance	14
B.1.5 Sanctions	15
B.2 Evaluation procedure	16
B.2.1 Conduct in the proceedings	16
B.2.2 Deliberation	16
B.2.3 Determination of results	17
B.2.4 Announcement of results and justification	17
C Competitions	17
C.1 Competition basics	17
C.1.1 Basic concept of a competition	17
C.1.2 Competition participation	18
C.1.3 Peculiarities of the debate process at competitions	19
C.2 Competition procedure	19
C.2.1 Preliminary rounds	19
C.2.2 Elimination rounds	20
C.2.3 Determination of the competition victory	20

Objective

The Open Parliamentary Debate pursues two goals: On the one hand, it is intended to provide a framework for rhetorical debate on contentious issues. It pursues this goal through a clear set of rules, which are described below. On the other hand, the Open Parliamentary Debate aims to promote debate in society on relevant issues and to spread a democratic culture of debate among the population. It pursues this goal in the careful selection of socially relevant contentious issues as topics of debate as well as argumentation that is as close to reality as possible.

A Debate

A.1 The motion

A.1.1 Formulation

- a) *Binary decision questions*: The motion of the debate must be a decision question that demands a clear statement, “yes” or “no”, with no third alternatives.¹
- b) *Unambiguity*: The question should be formulated unambiguously.

A.1.2 Relevance and practical relevance

- a) *Relevant issues*: The motion of the debate should be a socially relevant, practical contentious issue. Socially relevant issues are those that (i) are interesting or should be interesting for many people in society, as well as (ii) have an impact on parts of society. Practical contentious issues (so-called “proposal motions”) negotiate a specific action or omission.²
- b) *Exceptions for relevance and practicality, non-proposal topics*: However, it is also possible to raise a non-practical or less relevant contentious issue. In cases of non-practical contentious issues (so-called “non-proposal topics”), the government is explicitly exempted from proposing any measures. Non-proposal topics can include, among others, retrospective evaluations (e.g. “Would it have been better if X had never happened?”), forward-looking evaluations (e.g. “Would it be better if X ceased to exist?”), or predictions (e.g. “Will X happen?”). Such topics are especially useful when framing them as a proposal motion would significantly distort the topic or render it incomprehensible (e.g. “Should sexualised performances be celebrated as a triumph of feminism?”).

A.1.3 Prior assumptions and modifications

- a) *Missing specifications*: If motions do not stipulate otherwise, the following assumptions apply: For actor and place, the most obvious possible variants apply, i.e. initially the host country and its institutions, and for larger dimensions the next supranational body

¹This is because a (parliamentary) debate (as opposed to discussion) aims not only at clarification and exchange, but at decision. An example of a decision question would be: “Should the police monitor inner-city hotspots by video?”

²This point follows from the previous rule: practical questions make the topic clear, concrete and tangible – the debate is about consequences in political or social action. Technical, empirical or theoretical questions, on the other hand, leave it completely open what follows from the answer. They are not directly action-oriented and thus less relevant for the population than topics where a decision would also have concrete consequences. Proposal motions are usually marked by phrasing the question with “Should...?”, but that alone is not sufficient. “Should we give freedom priority over security?” would not be suitable as the motion of a debate, because it does not represent a specific (!) action or omission – “Should we introduce data retention?”, on the other hand, does.

(e.g. the EU or the UN). It is furthermore assumed by default that the debate takes place in the here and now.³

- b) *Additional specifications*: Motions can, however, also define a perspective from which the issue is to be examined, as well as a point in time or other additional assumptions. The debate's underlying argumentative assumptions change according to these specifications.⁴

A.1.4 Additional information

- a) *Field of application*: Motions that are beyond the general knowledge of most participants in terms of content can also be debated, by providing the minimum factual information necessary to understand a submitted question at the time of announcement.⁵ Information should be provided for such topics and only for such topics.
- b) *Scope and nature*: This information is only intended to guarantee a minimum level of background and knowledge of the status quo.⁶

A.2 Participating

A.2.1 Speakers

- a) *Debate participants*: Participants in the debate are three fixed speakers (opening, extending and closing) on each side of the government and opposition (pro and con) - the factions – as well as, usually, non-aligned speakers.
- b) *Team affiliation*: The government and opposition factions act as teams. The non-aligned speakers, on the other hand, act as individuals.

A.2.2 Panel and Presidency

- a) *Composition and purpose*: The debate further involves a main adjudicator and, where applicable, additional adjudicators. Together these people form a panel, because they carry out the evaluation of the debate on behalf of the audience. They also form a presidency, because – like the presidency of a real parliament – they preside over the debate neutrally: that is, they moderate it, monitor compliance with the rules, decide on their interpretation in cases of doubt, and take all necessary measures to enforce them.

³If the motion were, for example, “Should we build a tram?”, one would assume that the place of the debate is the city in which it takes place, and the actor is the municipal council or city government. If, on the other hand, it were “Should we subsidise the state railway company?”, the plausible place would be the country in which the debate takes place, and the actor the corresponding parliament or government. Finally, if it were about whether international rail lines within the EU should be expanded, the place would be the EU and the actor the corresponding EU institutions (or alternatively an international cooperation of the countries concerned). All three debates would take place in the here and now (even though the proposed measures would, of course, only be implemented in the future).

⁴Such additional assumptions are usually formulated in a preceding sentence. For example, a motion of the form “We are party X. Should we...?” would define party X not only as the actor, but also as the perspective. In this debate, only what is convincing for the corresponding actor, its interests and motives, would be persuasive. For the motion “We are in the year 1989. Should we...?”, on the other hand, only premises that applied at that time could be invoked; for the motion “We are in the universe of Game of Thrones. Should we...?”, only those that apply in that universe.

⁵This can, for example, reduce excessive inequalities between students from different disciplines and regions (especially where participants come from different countries).

⁶For example, for the question “Should the baby box be fully legalised in Germany?”, legitimate additional information would be: “The baby box is a possibility to give babies delivered at home into the care of a social institution (private associations, church or state organisations), bypassing all formalities. Within a certain period of time (8-10 weeks) the parents have the possibility to take their child back.”

- b) *Task and equipment of main adjudicators:* Main adjudicators take primary and outward-facing responsibility for the presiding role described above; they also lead the panel's internal work. In addition to a clock, they are equipped with a bell and a gavel, or comparable utensils, with which they can give equivalent acoustic (bell ringing/gavel strike) and visual (raising of gavel and bell) signals. Main adjudicators stop rule violations with a ring of the bell and/or a verbal admonition.
- c) *Tasks of additional adjudicators:* Additional adjudicators are responsible for evaluating the debate just as much as main adjudicators. In addition, they may alert main adjudicators to rule violations.
- d) *Delegation of tasks by main adjudicators:* Main adjudicators may hand over parts of their presidial responsibilities (e.g. timekeeping or stopping inappropriate interjections) to additional adjudicators. They may also hand over the moderation of the debate (opening and closing it, calling speeches, timekeeping) to people outside the panel. In every case, the nature and extent of the delegated responsibilities, as well as the person responsible, must be communicated clearly and unambiguously, and both sides must agree to it.

A.2.3 Addressing

- a) *Addressee:* The addressee of the persuasion is the audience.
- b) *Real audience:* Spectators external to the debate are part of the audience. Non-aligned speakers are also meant to be persuaded and are therefore part of the audience; they may also be addressed specifically in their role as non-aligned speakers. Adjudicators are also meant to be persuaded; but since they only take on the evaluation of the debate on behalf of the rest of the audience, they are not addressed in their role as the panel, but as normal audience. At most, they should be addressed specifically in their function as the neutral presidency.⁷
- c) *Public character of the debate; abstract audience:* The address of the debate participants to each other and to the audience should not slip into the private sphere, even with personal references. The character of the debate is public.⁸ Through its public character, an attempt is also made to persuade an abstract audience, consisting of the population that the simulated parliament represents.⁹

A.2.4 Simulation

- a) *Abstract parliament:* A debate is a simulation. The debate participants simulate an abstract, unspecified government, opposition, and non-aligned members of parliament in an abstract parliament, and should not present themselves as the real, existing government or opposition, or be identified with them. Even where a motion is set from the perspective

⁷Phrasings such as “You should pay special attention to that in your adjudication” are therefore not permitted. Deliberate (exclusive) flattery of the adjudicators is likewise not desired. A request to stop prohibited interjections, however, is permitted.

⁸A useful guideline is therefore whether one would give the same speech in a public debate before a foreign audience. It has become established practice not to classify the general use of informal address (“Du”) as “slipping into the private sphere”, since it can be a normal, level-headed way for young people to address one another.

⁹For example, if it is a municipal-political topic, the attempt is made to persuade the population of that municipality; for a national topic, the population of that country; and for an EU topic, the inhabitants of the European Union. This mirrors the character of real plenary speeches, which likewise do not address the entire world population, but the political discourse to which they are assigned.

of a particular actor, the debate participants should not simulate that actor's role.¹⁰

- b) *Concrete circumstances*: Otherwise, however, the real political circumstances of the territory in which the debate is set do apply.¹¹
- c) *Personal opinion*: The speakers of the factions primarily advocate for their positions. Agreement of personal opinion with the answer to the motion is not necessary in the OPD format, including for non-aligned speakers.

A.3 Course of the debate

A.3.1 Order of debate and duration of speeches

- a) *Preparation time*: As a rule, a preparation time precedes the debate.¹²
- b) *Opening of the debate*: Main adjudicators open the debate and state the motion. They determine the order of the debaters before the start of the speeches.
- c) *Order of speeches*: The debaters will give speeches on the motion one after the other. The order is as follows: Opening speech by the government, opening speech by the opposition, extension speech by the government, extension speech by the opposition, non-aligned speeches each answered by a reply speech by the opening or extending speaker of the opposing faction, closing speech by the opposition, closing speech by the government. In a case where no non-aligned speeches are held, the order of the two closing speeches is reversed.
- d) *Speaking time*: Faction speeches shall be given 7 minutes each; non-aligned speeches shall be given 3:30 minutes each. The first and last minute (in the case of non-aligned speeches the last 30 seconds) of this time is protected against questions and interjections in order to allow the participants in the debate to build up and conclude their speeches in an orderly manner. Questions offered and interjections made within the protected time shall be stopped by ringing the bell; however, questions accepted before the protected time may be finished.¹³ If speeches fall below the speaking time of 6 minutes (or 3 minutes for non-aligned speakers), the next speaker has the right to wait with their speech until the time remaining up to this mark has expired. Main adjudicators shall point out this right. If this right is not used, the remaining time is forfeited and the next speech is called directly. Reply speeches shall not exceed one minute of continuously protected speaking time. During the reply speech, any interjections are forbidden.
- e) *Stopping the speaking time*: Main adjudicators give the floor, but the start of the speech is always decided by the speakers. However, if main adjudicators have the impression that the start of the speech is being delayed in order to gain an unfair advantage, they should

¹⁰If, for example, the motion is "Should ESA launch a manned mission to Mars?", correct argumentation would be: "A manned Mars mission by ESA is generally important because..." Incorrect argumentation, on the other hand, would be: "We are the ESA, and I am an ESA engineer / I am the current federal government's minister of research. We consider a manned Mars mission important (to us) because..."

¹¹This concerns, for example, the current, real economic situation or political mood among the population. The line between the abstract parliament and the concrete, real circumstances is a fine one: it would not be legitimate for the opposition to identify the government speakers as representatives of the two real governing parties and to question their capacity to act on the basis of disputes between those parties (unless those disputes are explicitly part of the debate's motion). It would, however, be legitimate to point to real, existing dissatisfaction in the country and thereby cast doubt on the government's scope for imposing unpopular measures.

¹²A preparation time of 15 minutes has become established practice.

¹³According to this rule, questions accepted during the protected time should be stopped by the main adjudicators even if the speaker concerned would like to hear the question.

remind the speakers to start the speech and count down from 5 seconds. At the latest after these 5 seconds, the speaking time begins to run, regardless of whether the speech actually begins. During the speeches, main adjudicators mark the beginning and end of the time for questions with a single time signal. The end of the speaking time is indicated by a double time signal, immediately followed by the main adjudicators ringing the bell to stop the speech. If the time limits for questions are exceeded, main adjudicators ring the bell immediately.

- f) *Announcement of the bell*: There is a need for ironclad rigour in enforcing speaking times. Before the time signal at the end of the speaking-time buffer, main adjudicators must raise their hand at least 5 seconds before ringing the bell. If the hand is not raised in time, no penalty may be given, unless the speech continues until 5 seconds after the hand is raised.
- g) *Interruption of the debate*: Main adjudicators may interrupt the debate if external constraints make this necessary. If a speech has been unreasonably hindered by external influences, main adjudicators may extend the speaking time appropriately.¹⁴ This and the additional amount of time granted shall be announced by the main adjudicator immediately after the disruption by means of a heckle.
- h) *Closing of the debate*: The main adjudicators close the debate. A handshake of the debaters follows.
- i) *Feedback*: Optionally, feedback is given by the panel after the debate.

A.3.2 Opening speech of the government

- a) *Tasks*: The government's opening speech concretises the wording of the contentious issue. For practical questions, this means making a proposal. The government's opening speech must introduce the motion in terms of content, so that everything necessary to conduct the debate is clarified. It explains and argues for the government's position. These tasks also apply in the case of non-proposal topics.
- b) *Proposal*: The proposal must show the audience and the other participants who is to carry out which action and how, so that the possible feasibility of the measure is beyond question and it can also be seen what price must be paid for it. The proposal must be detailed enough that the audience has an idea of how the implementation of the measure would work, what it would achieve, and what the opportunity costs would be. It is not necessary to state everything down to the cent, second, or specific number of people, but orders of magnitude and factors important for success should be explained in a way that is easy to understand.
- c) *Binding of the proposal to the motion*: The wording of the question binds both factions, but it still has to be interpreted in the debate. A proposal may make necessary exceptions, but may not restrict the contentious issue so far as to hollow out its core. The government may normatively advocate for measures or principles that go beyond the proposal but are consistent with it, but may not propose them.¹⁵

¹⁴Examples would be a disturbance by the building management, a power failure, a fire alarm, etc.

¹⁵A government proposal may not go beyond the wording of the motion (example: "Should the party 'Der III. Weg' be banned?") (for example: "Right-wing parties should be banned"), but may also not restrict it significantly ("The party's youth organisation should be banned"). Measures or principles that go beyond the proposal but are consistent with it ("Other parties should also be banned in future given the same burden of proof") may be normatively advocated by the government, but not proposed. The interpretation of the wording in the debate is the concretisation of the proposed measure (here: description of what is to be understood by the ban in detail) or of the development to be assessed (in the case of a non-proposal topic).

- d) *Side debates through the motion*: The proposal must not be significantly and unnecessarily more contentious than the motion itself, and thereby lead the debate away from its topic.¹⁶

A.3.3 Handling missing or incorrect motions

- a) *Inadmissible motions*: Motions that restrict the contentious issue too much, go too far beyond it, trigger overly large side debates, or are otherwise incompatible with the wording of the contentious issue, are inadmissible.
- b) *Questioning an incorrect government motion*: All debate participants and additional adjudicators may, after the government's first speech, ask the main adjudicators whether the motion is compatible with the contentious issue. No discussion takes place.
- c) *Consequence of inadmissible or missing motions*: If the government's opening speech makes an inadmissible motion, or no motion at all, the main adjudicators state which parts of the motion are incompatible with the contentious issue, or that the motion is missing.¹⁷ In this decision, they take into account the government's latitude for judgement and framing. They further state that the opposition has the opportunity, in its opening speech, to set out what a sensible motion would have looked like (a substitute motion). Substitute motions are admissible if they are compatible with the contentious issue and are not evidently designed to the government's disadvantage. The opposition's opening speech may make a substitute motion even without the main adjudicators explicitly pointing this out.
- d) *Deciding between competing motions*: After the opposition's opening speech, the main adjudicators state which motion better corresponds to the contentious issue (if only one was made, that one), and that this is the one to be debated further. If no motion is made, or only motions that entirely distort the contentious issue are made, the main adjudicators state that the debate becomes non-proposal. This means that it becomes the subject of the debate what motion the actor of the debate would probably implement.

A.3.4 Opening speech of the opposition

- a) *Task*: The opposition's opening speech replies to the government's opening speech. If there are any ambiguities or problems in the government's opening speech that call into question the possible implementation of the motion, it points them out. It argues against the government's position by refuting it and building its own opposition position.
- b) *Alternatives to the proposal and binding to the question*: The opposition group criticises the government's proposal, but is not obliged to present its own concept. However, it may be useful for persuasion to state alternatives to the proposal. Such alternatives should not be reasonably compatible with the government's proposal.
- c) *Binding to the question*: The opposition's position and any alternatives to the proposal are bound to the wording of the contentious issue in the same way as the government's.

¹⁶In a debate on the establishment of state-funded elite universities, for example, the government could not propose the complete abolition of unemployment benefits or the armed forces as a means of funding, since these proposals are manifestly more controversial than the issue at hand and the debate could thus unduly stray from its question. In a debate on universal basic income or a nationalised healthcare system, on the other hand, it would be legitimate to propose the complete abolition of unemployment benefits and high taxes on the wealthy as a means of funding, since these are in any case controversial measures, and an audience is more likely to raise the question of funding such expensive measures in the first place.

¹⁷A motion is normally, but not necessarily, missing if the measure is not explicitly stated. For example, in the case of the motion "Should local referendums be abolished?", it can become implicitly clear what the government is calling for, without it ever saying the sentence "We are abolishing all local referendums."

A.3.5 Extension speeches

The extension speeches of the government and the opposition deepen the arguments already presented, defend them, and add new arguments. They refute the arguments of the opposing side and clarify any problems or ambiguities that have arisen. They ensure that the function of the various lines of argument becomes increasingly clear within the overall context of the debate.

A.3.6 Non-aligned speeches

- a) *Tasks*: The purpose of the non-aligned speeches is to bring the debate forward in terms of arguments – for example, through new arguments, deepening existing analyses, introducing new perspectives, meaningful refutations of arguments already mentioned, alternatives to the proposal, etc. Following the extension speeches, they express themselves in a pre-determined order.
- b) *Positioning*: Non-aligned speakers may formulate their own position for or against the contentious issue, and persuade for this position. In doing so, however, they must either support the government (in the case of proposal motions: the proposal) or not.
- c) *Disclosure of positioning*: Non-aligned speeches clearly indicate within the first minute whether they support the government or not.¹⁸ If the classification of the speech according to government and opposition is not yet obvious after the first minute, main adjudicators shall call for comments.

A.3.7 Closing speeches

- a) *Tasks*: The closing speech weighs the arguments for the government side against the arguments for the opposition side so that it is apparent to the audience that they should vote for their side. The closing speech may explain existing arguments in more depth and further refute arguments of the other side.
- b) *Prohibition of new lines of argument*: This rebuttal should refer either directly to weaknesses in the opponent's argument or to arguments of the own team. However, new lines of argument are not allowed for reasons of fairness. The prohibition of introducing new arguments should not be confused with a deeper examination of thematic content already addressed in the form of new examples or in-depth analysis on points already dealt with previously: Clarification and elucidation of inferences already introduced into the debate is permitted.

A.4 Interaction during the debate

A.4.1 Means of interaction

- a) *Purpose and types of interaction*: Reply speeches, questions and interjections are special means of interaction. They ensure reference and direct exchange among the debate participants and support the factions in clarifying their points of contention. They encourage the speakers to stay on topic, to speak plainly and to make possible implications explicit.
- b) *Commitment to interaction*: Reply speeches are compulsory, questions and interjections are encouraged.¹⁹ Questions are the means of choice for more complex issues, whereas

¹⁸The purpose of this is so that the factions who will subsequently hold the reply speech can prepare for it in good time.

¹⁹Holding reply speeches is obligatory so that the opinions of the non-aligned speakers cannot be ignored and the debate always remains at the level of its problem development. Offering questions and making interjections

interjections are a means of providing impetus for content or a concise rebuttal of a statement. Interjections are only desirable to the extent that they do not interfere with the development of the debate and a substantive discussion of the topic. They must be finely dosed.

A.4.2 Reply speeches

- a) *Tasks:* Reply speeches are the means for factions to comment on opposing non-aligned speeches. The reply speech is purely a reply with the purpose of re-promotion or clarification. The primary aim of every reply speech should be to win the non-aligned speaker over to one's own side. If their interests are absolutely not alignable with the reply speaker's, the non-aligned speaker and the audience should be shown why the ideals espoused by the reply speaker's own side are preferable to their stated interests.²⁰ The reply speech has to be specific to the speech of the non-aligned speaker and must not be used in an unconnected way for general remarks.
- b) *Speaking time:* Reply speeches are limited to one minute and are made from the floor. Questions and interjections are not permitted for reply speeches. The same rules on timekeeping apply with regard to time signals, buffer time and the bell.
- c) *Speakers:* Reply speeches are held by the government if the non-aligned speech spoke against the proposal, and by the opposition if the speech spoke in favour of the proposal.
- d) *Requests for further reply speeches:* In the event of fundamental contradiction between the content of non-aligned speeches and the argumentation of the faction on whose side the speeches are to be attributed, the factions concerned shall also have the right to make a reply speech on application.²¹ The application for a reply speech shall be made immediately after the conclusion of the non-aligned speech by a faction member without further justification, and shall be decided and announced by the main adjudicators without debate. The granting of the additional right to a reply speech for a non-aligned speech that has formally joined a side, but is explicitly in fundamental contradiction to it, is to be handled in an extremely restrictive manner. It only serves to ensure the progress of the debate and fairness towards the team concerned in obvious exceptional cases. Conditional argumentation ("even if...") is usually not a sign of fundamental contradiction in this sense.

A.4.3 Questions

- a) *Tasks:* Questions are short statements, often - but not exclusively - formulated in the form of questions, which implicitly or explicitly ask speakers to deal more closely with certain contents of the debate or to explain them further. They must be understandable for the audience and the speaker.

is desirable because they can both enliven and deepen the debate and contribute to the audience's decision in favour of one side, without being absolutely necessary for the continuation of the debate.

²⁰An example of such a case could be a non-aligned speech in a debate about sexualised violence, in which the speaker recounts their own experience of abuse and thereby clearly aligns with one side. In such a case, it may be the more persuasive and tactful option to express sympathy for the person and refrain from trying to refute or persuade them, and instead to make the case for one's own position to the audience.

²¹An example would be a non-aligned speech that speaks out against the government because it considers the government's proposal to be bad, but would have agreed to a different, better proposal. Here the opposition would likely want to show why this alternative proposal is not a good idea either.

- b) *Duration*: Questions last a maximum of 15 seconds.²²
- c) *Authorisation to offer questions*: All speakers who do not belong to the faction of the speaker are entitled to offer questions. Questions may not be offered within the protected speaking time. During a non-aligned speech, the side for which they are taking sides may not offer questions.
- d) *Offering questions*: Questions are offered by the questioner standing from their seat. If the speaker accepts a question, it is presented in full; it should only be interrupted once it clearly becomes redundant.
- e) *Rejection of questions*: If several questions are pending, all other pending questions shall be deemed rejected if one question is accepted or rejected. Those offering rejected questions shall be seated again immediately.²³
- f) *Decision on questions*: The explicit decision to accept or decline an offered question is a requirement of politeness (one does not leave questioners out in the cold) and serves to clarify the situation.²⁴
- g) *Privilege questions*: If no question by a faction was accepted during the opposing side's opening and extension speeches, that faction is entitled to a privilege question during the other side's closing speech. A privilege question shall be marked with the word "privilege question" when the question is offered, must be offered before the start of the fifth minute, and must be accepted by the speaker before the protected time. Main adjudicators enforce this right. If none of the faction's members marks a question as a privilege question before the end of the fourth minute, this right is forfeited.²⁵ Tactically refraining from offering questions during the opponent's opening and extension speeches in the hope of receiving a privilege question is blatantly poor interaction. Privilege questions may no longer be solicited after the conclusion of the fourth minute, in order to ensure that the speakers in question are able to adequately frame their closing remarks. If the right to a privilege question exists, the main adjudicators shall announce this right before the start of the speech.

A.4.4 Interjections

- a) *Tasks*: Interjections are a means for all debaters to point out inconsistencies, argumentative gaps, aberrations and the like to speakers and to encourage them to clarify.
- b) *Length and Limitation*: Interjections must not exceed 7 words in length; "7 words" is to be understood as a rule of thumb. Interjections must not become short speeches. Callers may not have more than 2 interjections on the same point immediately following each other and may not enter into a dialogue with the speaker together with other debaters. Interjections must not be used as purely acoustic disruptive manoeuvres.
- c) *Prohibiting interjections*: Speakers may prohibit interjections. In this case, all interjections

²²If one's own question could not be finished within the 15 seconds, it is still possible to offer the question again. However, it is up to the speaker whether they take up the question again.

²³There is no fixed time that the bench must wait after a question has been rejected before a new one may be offered. A rough guideline is around 15 seconds, but this should be judged differently depending on the situation.

²⁴Because questions should be tied to the situation of the debate, teams cannot be expected to have suitable questions ready at all times. Accordingly, it should be counted against speakers if they call for questions at only one point in their speech and otherwise refuse interaction with them.

²⁵The privilege question serves to ensure that a team can be fairly adjudicated.

are prohibited in the following minute of the speech.²⁶ In order to make it unmistakably clear to all participants when interjections are forbidden, main adjudicators indicate the time limit by raising a hand for the duration of the minute. The “forbidding” must explicitly refer to interjections or the minute limit, a simple ‘silence please’ is not sufficient. Main adjudicators also have the right to raise a hand at their own discretion if interjections unreasonably interfere with the speech. Interjections may be prohibited, but not questions.

B Evaluation

B.1 Scale and object of the evaluation

B.1.1 Aim of the evaluation

- a) *Performance evaluation*: Especially at competitions, factions and debaters should be evaluated according to their performance in the debate.²⁷ The only yardstick for the evaluation is the set of rules presented here.
- b) *Evaluation from the audience’s point of view*: Adjudicators should evaluate from the perspective of interested, generally educated and open-minded representatives of the abstract audience (i.e. the population that the simulated parliament represents). Adjudicators should reflect on larger deviations from this perspective and not let these deviations factor into the evaluation. Their political preferences should therefore have no influence on the evaluation. However, adjudicators’ specialist knowledge may be used to evaluate objectively false statements of fact made by debaters as such.²⁸
- c) *Impact evaluation*: Open Parliamentary Debate as a sporting debating format does not evaluate actions, but effects. It follows the primacy of the persuasive in all aspects. Good is what helps to persuade an interested, generally educated audience, bad is what hinders it. It can be assumed that such an audience has no prejudices against speakers. However, external characteristics such as body size and voice may well contribute to the fact that actions or lines of argumentation by different speakers are perceived differently by an audience, i.e. produce a different effect.²⁹ How persuasive an individual rhetorical action is,

²⁶There is no limit to how often, in succession, a speaker may prohibit interjections. However, it would be up to the panel to judge, depending on the situation, whether the person was genuinely disrupted on an ongoing basis, or merely wanted to refuse interaction with the other side (the latter would be unconvincing).

²⁷Behaviour outside the debate, for example during the preparation time or during the feedback, therefore does not factor into the evaluation. If a team were to stand out there for disrespectful behaviour, however, there is the option of sanctioning them within the framework and rules of the corresponding event (for example, the debating club and its debate evenings).

²⁸The emphasis is on “objectively”; this right is to be used sparingly: If, for example, a speaker claims that country X has the highest social spending, but the adjudicator knows from their economics degree that this is definitely not the case according to official statistics, they may factor this in, even though they would not have known this as a “generally educated spectator”. If, on the other hand, she lists negative consequences of high social spending that are viewed critically by a majority in economics, or are no longer “in vogue”, but are not clearly refuted by scientific consensus, the adjudicator may not factor this in. This rule is intended to curb the spread of lies and myths, but is not an invitation to pedantry or to the introduction of subjective views, however well they may be scientifically grounded.

²⁹This also applies to physical limitations. A lack of eye contact by a blind speaker, or a lack of fluent speech by a speaker who chronically stutters, will irritate adjudicators less and therefore cost less persuasive power than it would for speakers without these limitations. At the same time, a speech with great eye contact or fluent speech may nonetheless be more captivating and persuasive. Judging people according to how they speak within the limits of their abilities would be too speculative, and would also have strange consequences, such as a speaker who “really did quite well for a beginner” being rated better than a top speaker who “had a bad day by her standards” – even if her speech was nonetheless clearly more persuasive.

is a highly subjective value - depending, among other things, on the subjective preferences of the respective addressees, here: the adjudicators. In order to record performance more objectively, the impressions of as many adjudicators as possible (calibrated to a certain scale) are averaged. The larger the number of (calibrated) adjudicators, the more objective the result.

B.1.2 Rating according to points

- a) *Individual and team performances*: Team and individual performances are evaluated. Political groups receive points according to their team performance. Speakers receive points according to their individual performance. “Individual performance” is the effect of the speech at the time at the lectern. “Team performance” assesses the performance of the teams in the overall context of the debate.
- b) *Point scale*: An absolute standard applies to the awarding of points itself. The highest score is reserved for the best possible performance. For orientation, the point scale of the German school-system can be used (assuming strict grading); the range of 15-20 points then serves primarily to profile the top performances at competitions. Indicative values are accordingly: 0 points = non-existent; 1-3 points = poor (very clear weaknesses); 4-6 points = just satisfactory (weaknesses predominate); 7-9 points = satisfactory (strengths/weaknesses in balance); 10-12 points = good (strengths predominate); 14-16 points = very good (hardly any weaknesses); >15 points = outstanding performance. Where other scales are mentioned in the regulations, the relations shift accordingly.

B.1.3 Individual performance

- a) *Individual categories*: Individual performance is assessed in 5 categories: speaking, demeanour, contact, expertise, and judgement. The categories listed tap into 5 aspects that together form a functional structure: The oratorical performance. None of these aspects can be completely isolated from the others, so all 5 aspects are present in every speech.³⁰
- b) *Points per category*: A maximum of 20 points will be awarded in each category.³¹
- c) *Speaking*: Speaking means comprehensibility, clarity and appropriateness in language and voice. A good performance in speaking means that the verbal dimension of the presentation is shaped in such a way that the audience enjoys listening, understands what is meant, finds the speakers likeable and credible and remembers what they say. Speakers achieve this by working with the voice and working with words. The category is not to be understood as an end in itself: There is no positive evaluation of speaking should it not serve the ultimate purpose of persuading people of one’s side.³²
- d) *Demeanour*: Demeanour assesses the extent to which the speaker’s visual presence contributes to persuading the audience. A good appearance supports the speaker’s verbal message with authentic accompaniment in posture, stance and movement in the room, gestures, facial expressions and gaze. What is important is not what the speaker does, but whether it fits the speech and whether it helps to persuade the audience of one’s own side.

³⁰Therefore, an effect produced by an action (for example, eye contact perceived as captivating) can indeed be evaluated in several categories at once (in this case, in demeanour and contact).

³¹A competent speech performance should therefore receive an average in the 50s (good range). A speech in which strengths and weaknesses are balanced throughout, on the other hand, comes to 40 points (8 per category).

³²For example, a three-minute anecdote unrelated to the topic, regardless of its internal excellence, cannot be grounds for a very good rating in speaking; however, as a short introduction to entertain and thus engage the audience, it can receive a very good rating in the context of a speech.

- e) *Contact*: Contact means the ability to adjust to the respective circumstances of the debate. This happens on a content-related and emotional level. In terms of content, good performance in contact requires, on the one hand, referring to relevant developments in the debate so far,³³ illustrating the subject matter of the debate and, on the other hand, dealing appropriately with questions and interjections. Contact does not scale with the quantity of answered questions/interjections; in general, however, a contactable speech gives the opposing team sufficient opportunity to interact. On an emotional level, a contactable speech builds rapport with the audience. This can be done, for example, through quick-witted interaction with the opposing team, humour, created emotions and eye contact. This requires a feeling for the situation and relating to the audience. Confident speakers do not shy away from offering the other side the opportunity to interact within the framework of speaking time and possibilities.³⁴
- f) *Expertise*: Expertise means the ability to plausibly justify, explain and present arguments for one's own side. The key question is: "Is what is being said correct?" Expertise assesses the correctness of facts used for argumentation, the reasonableness of conclusions and the plausibility of justifications. Expert knowledge can contribute to argumentation if it is built into consistent conclusions. Otherwise, it will hardly contribute to the establishment of expertise and should rather be assessed with low points. The use of subject-relevant expertise without good integration into the argumentation structure will nevertheless contribute more to the credibility of the speech in terms of content than the omission of expertise or even the use of false statements of fact.
- g) *Judgement*: Judgement asks to what extent speaking time is used efficiently. The key question is: "Is the right thing said?" This includes the correct selection and prioritisation of arguments, selective intensive engagement with previous speeches and the arrangement of the speech material.

B.1.4 Team performance

- a) *Team categories*: The factions' team performance is evaluated in 3 categories: strategy, interaction and persuasion.
- b) *Points per category*: A maximum of 75 points will be awarded in each of the first two categories, and a maximum of 50 points in the last.
- c) *Strategy*: Strategy evaluates the impact of a speech retrospectively in the overall context of the debate. A maximum of 25 points can be assigned per speech (opening, extension, closing). Strategy is about occupying and fulfilling the respective function in the team. The tasks of the speakers are to be considered in light of the need to persuade the audience. This typically, but not necessarily, includes: Opening: Substantive introduction to the debate and the proposal (government); critical engagement with the proposal (opposition); explanation of and argumentation for one's own position (government); engagement with the opposing side's position and building of one's own position (opposition). Extension: Deepening and defending arguments already presented; new arguments; refutation of the opposing side's arguments; clarifying problems and ambiguities; clarifying the function of different lines of argument in the overall context of the debate. Closing speech: Weighing

³³This option is of course not available to the government's opening speaker. For them, it is all the more important to "illustrate the subject matter of the debate" and thereby prepare the substantive course of the rest of the debate.

³⁴Because questions should be tied to the situation of the debate, teams cannot be expected to have suitable questions ready at all times. Accordingly, it should be counted against speakers if they call for questions only at a sudden point in their speech, thereby catching the other side off guard, while otherwise refusing interaction.

one's own arguments against those of the opposing side; explaining one's own arguments in more depth and refuting the opposing side's arguments; no new lines of argument.

- d) *Interaction*: Interaction means the use of reply speeches, questions and interjections. A maximum of 30 points can be awarded for reply speeches and questions, and a maximum of 15 points for interjections. Awards are given for effectiveness in clarification, precision in examination, wit (acumen, humour, repartee) in shaping. (i) In addition to their evaluation in terms of content as an adequate response to the non-aligned speech, reply speeches are also to be evaluated in terms of their quality as a speech: in addition to their argumentative strength, their scoring should accordingly take speaking, demeanour and contact into account. If no reply speech can be held (because all non-aligned speeches join their own faction), the same number of points as for "questions" must be entered in the score sheet. (ii) The evaluation of questions takes into account whether they advance the debate in terms of content. This can be both constructive, e.g. by asking necessary comprehension questions, and destructive, e.g. by pointing out gaps in the opponent's argumentation or a lack of engagement of the other side with important material. The quality of the questions asked is primarily decisive for the assessment. The number of questions offered is only relevant when hardly any questions from a team have been accepted. Questions that are announced with an announcement (e.g. "Exactly on that!" or "Comprehension question!"), but then, contrary to the announcement, address something else, are unsporting and thus to be rated lower. (iii) The evaluation of interjections should take into account, in addition to their quality, a sense of whether and when interjections are appropriate at all.³⁵
- e) *Persuasiveness*: Persuasiveness means the overall appearance of the faction, especially its unity as a team and its dedication to the debate. The key question for evaluation is: 'Was the team convincing as a unit?' Teams are convincing as a team in terms of content if a clear line can be discerned, can be consistently maintained from beginning to end and can also persuade at the end of the debate. Ignoring material from the other side and deliberately refusing to answer questions is just as unconvincing as constantly changing or contradictory positions on content. Teams are emotionally convincing as a team by attentively following the debate, taking it seriously as a unit and eagerly trying to persuade the audience as well. Teams that hang lethargically in their chairs and only shuffle to the lectern to speak are not very persuasive.

B.1.5 Sanctions

- a) *Deductions*: If speakers commit rule violations that are likely to harm the competing debate participants or the reputation of Open Parliamentary Debate, a sanction is imposed through a point deduction, over and above any poor rating in the relevant categories. The following sanctions are available: minor deduction (3 points), major deduction (15 points), no points. Deductions can be given by a two-thirds majority of the adjudicators and not against the vote of the main adjudicators; no points even requires unanimity. The deductions are subtracted after averaging and, if necessary, rounding of points.
- b) *Timeframe and target of deductions*: Deductions can only be given to individuals, i.e. their individual points, and for behaviour during the debate. This includes not only the speech itself, but also conduct worthy of deduction from the bench. If the behaviour was engaged in by the whole team, corresponding deductions can be given to all team members on their

³⁵In many debates, the absence of interjections will be perceived as a deficient, but not absent performance (after all, it is still a productive choice worth recognising not to interrupt the opposing team incessantly, but the weakness of a lack of high-quality interjections clearly outweighs this). However, debates are conceivable in which it is in fact a very good performance not to interrupt at all a team that has broken down in tears over a highly emotional topic.

individual points; in addition, in this case – as well as for misconduct outside the debate – recourse can be had to sanctions within the framework of the event (e.g. disqualification).

- c) *Minor deductions:* A minor deduction is intended for rule violations that cause a small amount of potential harm to the format or to the other debate participants. It can be given for the following violations: (a) exceeding the speaking time by up to 15 seconds, or (b) departing from the debate simulation in a way that attacks the personal credibility of other speakers or adjudicators by disregarding the debate setting.³⁶
- d) *Major deductions:* A major deduction is intended for rule violations that cause substantial potential harm to the format or to the other debate participants. It can be given for the following violations: (a) persistent disregard of the instructions of the presidency (e.g. when interjections were prohibited, or for speeches that exceed the speaking time by more than 15 seconds), (b) gross insults towards other debate participants or the presidency or panel, (c) or completely missing the topic, i.e. conducting an entirely different debate.
- e) *No points:* No points is intended for rule violations that cause massive potential harm to the format or to the other debate participants, or that frustrate the debate as such. It can be given for the following violations: (a) failing to appear for the debate, or (b) any misconduct for which the panel unanimously agrees that it is not adequately sanctioned by a minor or major deduction (in particular in cases of the most severe insults and discrimination).

B.2 Evaluation procedure

B.2.1 Conduct in the proceedings

The evaluation and deliberation are held in a fair, constructive, collegial and respectful manner.

B.2.2 Deliberation

- a) *Place and time:* After the end of the debate, the jury leaves for deliberation or the audience and speakers leave the room temporarily.
- b) *Duration:* Adjudicators should have a maximum of 20 minutes for deliberation, and another 5 minutes for tallying the points.³⁷
- c) *Objective:* The deliberation serves to check the congruence between perception and scoring of the debate. In cases that deviate from this, however, it is not valid to impose one's own subjective assessment on others.³⁸ If there is sufficient time, the adjudicators can address individual performances and scores of speeches and make corrections to their own

³⁶For example, it would be illegitimate to argue: "Your fervent case for capitalism sounds pretty unrealistic when you know how you otherwise talk in your left-wing university group. And it will hardly convince the adjudicator from that same university group either. Besides, we're just ordinary students in a debating club, so there's no reason for such a big drama." This departs from the debate simulation and thereby undermines the credibility of the opposing speaker as well as of the adjudicator. It would, by contrast, be unproblematic to speak of one's own experiences as a student. It is also conceivable, even within the abstract debate simulation, to be a member of parliament as a young person; moreover, this does not undermine the credibility of other speeches.

³⁷This upper limit serves not only to ensure a swift process for everyone involved, but also an evaluation that is based on the authentic impression of the debate, rather than on everything that gets read into it during an adjudicators' discussion.

³⁸According to the rules, it can therefore be checked whether adjudicators have taken account of major deviations of themselves from the assumed audience. If this is the case, however, subjective differences in perception or evaluation are part of that and are not a flaw that needs to be corrected, even if they turn out to be large.

assessment if necessary. However, the discussion about the team performance and possible deduction criteria has clear priority in the adjudicators' meeting.³⁹

- d) *Procedure*: The deliberation is led by the main adjudicator. All adjudicators have their say in the discussion, but not necessarily to the same extent.
- e) *Removal from the judging*: In extremely exceptional cases, it is possible for additional adjudicators to voluntarily remove themselves from the judging. The main adjudicator must be informed of this immediately.⁴⁰

B.2.3 Determination of results

- a) *Averaging of scores*: By adding up the scores, it is meant that the adjudicators calculate an arithmetic mean of the respective scores of all adjudicators for all individual and team performances.
- b) *Type of result*: The scores averaged in this way represent the outcome of the debate. Part of the result can also be the highlighting of the most persuasive faction or the most persuasive individual speech.
- c) *Determination of the most persuasive performance*: The faction that scored the most points in the sum of individual and team performances in the jury vote was the most persuasive. The speech that scored the most points in the comparison of individual performances in the jury vote was the most persuasive. In the event of a tie, a simple majority of the adjudicators decides; if there is still a tie, the main adjudicator decides; if they then perceive the performances as equally persuasive, the debate is considered a draw.

B.2.4 Announcement of results and justification

- a) *Objective*: After the deliberation, the factions and non-aligned speakers will receive the result and a justification of the result from the main adjudicator. This justification must justify the awarding of points, tied to the underlying descriptions for the awarded points (as given in the rulebook and on the adjudication sheet).
- b) *Feedback*: Debate feedback should be respectful and received in silence. Afterwards, the speakers should be given the opportunity to ask questions.

C Competitions

C.1 Competition basics

C.1.1 Basic concept of a competition

- a) *Definition of a competition*: A competition involves a number of teams, divisible by 3, competing over at least 3 consecutive debates (called rounds). The aim of the competition is to determine a winning team.

³⁹Team performance therefore carries greater weight, because conclusions can also be drawn from it about individual performances: If [translator's note: the German source text is cut off at this point and does not continue.]

⁴⁰Such extremely exceptional cases would include, for example, an adjudicator judging for the first time who finds that they cannot yet cope with the points system, or an adjudicator who is so emotionally invested in the topic that they cannot judge it neutrally. This rule does not, however, apply to main adjudicators, because there must be at least one suitable person who judges and presides over the debate. They could, of course, ask to have other main adjudicators put in their place.

- b) *Debate rooms*: If there are more than 3 teams in the competition, parallel debates take place in different rooms in each round. Which team is in which room is determined by a so-called draw.
- c) *Types of competition and rounds*: In one type of competition (e.g. a classic tournament), after rounds in which all teams take part - so-called preliminary rounds - there are elimination rounds (e.g. quarter-finals, semi-finals and finals) for which the best teams and speakers qualify. In the other type of competition (e.g. a league), there are only preliminary rounds (alternatively, the term “rounds” or “match days” is used).

C.1.2 Competition participation

- a) *Conditions for participation in the competition*: Teams made up of exactly 3 people may take part in a competition. In justified exceptional cases (e.g. illness), it is possible to replace team members during the course of the competition in consultation with the chief adjudicators. The chief adjudicators may define additional conditions for participation in the competition.⁴¹ If teams or individual speakers commit serious violations (in particular serious competition-specific violations)⁴², they can be disqualified or excluded from scoring by the chief adjudicators.
- b) *Complete team absences in preliminary rounds*: If a complete team is absent in a preliminary round, it will be awarded no points in the respective debate according to the scoring rules. They must be replaced by the chief adjudicators with substitute speakers.
- c) *Partial team absence in preliminary rounds for faction speeches*: If a team is partially incomplete in faction speeches in the preliminary rounds, there are two options: Either the missing speakers are replaced by the chief adjudicators with substitutes or a remaining team member delivers several team speeches. Only in the latter case does the team retain its eligibility for elimination rounds and the competition victory, if it also appears plausible to the chief adjudicators that the person concerned could not reasonably be expected to participate in the debate due to the nature of the topic or a reason inherent in the person concerned. In cases of doubt, the person concerned must be heard if he or she invokes this rule.⁴³ In both cases of substitution, the individual points of the substituted speech will be attributed to the team in the total points, but not to the person who dropped out in the individual speech points.
- d) *Partial team absence in preliminaries for non-aligned speeches*: If a team is partially incomplete in the preliminary rounds of non-aligned speeches, the missing speech will be cancelled without replacement and the team will accordingly be credited several times with the score of the lowest-scoring speeches made by the team in that round. Otherwise, the same rules apply for the crediting of points in total and individual points as well as for the qualification for elimination rounds and competition victory.
- e) *Absent speakers in elimination rounds*: If a team is incomplete in elimination rounds, the next strongest team will be re-qualified and the draw adjusted accordingly.

⁴¹For example, a tournament could be aimed only at beginners in their first year of debating, or at teams from southern Germany.

⁴²This would include, for example, disregard of the ban on digital research defined further below.

⁴³If, for example, the debate addresses sexual abuse, it would probably be plausible, given the nature of the topic, for the chief adjudicators to accept that a person does not wish to take part in this debate; it would then also not be necessary for the person to disclose their own experiences to justify this. If, on the other hand, the debate is about reducing bureaucracy, it would probably not be immediately obvious why it is unreasonable to expect a person to take part in it. In this case, however, the person concerned should at least be heard.

C.1.3 Peculiarities of the debate process at competitions

- a) *Jury in the debate room*: The jury in each room consists of at least one person, but at least 3 are recommended. Adjudicators must not have a close personal relationship (e.g. through partnership or activity in the same debating society) with the debaters – unless other suitable adjudicators are not available.⁴⁴
- b) *Involuntary removal from adjudication*: If an adjudicator grossly violates the rules of OPD, other adjudicators in that debate have the option of applying to the chief adjudicators to have that adjudicator's points removed from the scoring for that round. The chief adjudicators may do so, but only after having heard the adjudicator concerned.⁴⁵
- c) *Speakers per debate room*: The number of non-aligned speakers per room is 3. These non-aligned speakers should preferably come from 3 different teams. The factions each consist of one other team, so that there are a total of 9 speakers in one room.
- d) *Order*: The factions choose the distribution of their speaking roles themselves, the order of the non-attached speakers is determined in advance.
- e) *Motion announcement*: The motion of a debate round is the same for every room. It is announced simultaneously to all faction speakers, excluding the non-aligned speakers. Non-aligned speakers receive the motion at the beginning of the debate.
- f) *Preparation time*: The preparation time for each debate room is the same, predetermined time, but at least and usually simply 15 minutes. It begins with the announcement of the motion. During the preparation time, the government may use the debate room.
- g) *Research and digital aids*: Speakers are not allowed to conduct digital research. The chief adjudicators may make exceptions. If an explicit regulation is made, all participants must be aware of it early enough to be able to arrive with the appropriate material. The use of digital tools (mobile phone, laptop, etc.) is allowed during the preparation time and the debate, as long as they are used exclusively for timekeeping, taking notes and, if necessary, dictionaries for non-native speakers.
- h) *Announcement of results*: For reasons of time, dramaturgy or other organisational reasons, the announcement of results can be planned shorter, longer or delayed by the chief adjudicators for individual rounds or certain competitions.

C.2 Competition procedure

C.2.1 Preliminary rounds

- a) *Seeding in preliminary rounds*: In preliminary rounds, the debaters are not allowed to choose their room and their position (government, opposition or non-factional), nor the order of the non-aligned speeches in the respective room. Instead, this order is determined by a random draw.
- b) *Balance of seeding*: When drawing lots for seeding, it must be ensured that all teams are seeded as equally as possible in the course of the preliminary rounds in each of the 3 positions (Government – Opposition – Non-aligned Speech), as well as on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd non-aligned Speech. The number of preliminary rounds must therefore be at least 3 and should be divisible by 3.

⁴⁴This is intended to ensure a neutral evaluation, both in substance and in appearance.

⁴⁵Large deviations in scoring from the other adjudicators and/or a not particularly eloquent justification in the jury discussion alone do not amount to the grossest violation of the rules.

- c) *1st additional round:* If another round is added after a number of preliminary rounds divisible by 3, the following special features apply to the seeding: The third of the teams with the lowest number of points up to that point holds the non-aligned speeches; the top two thirds meet each other (as before, by drawing lots).
- d) *2nd additional round:* The same procedure as for an additional round applies to a potential 2nd additional round, the middle third of teams in total points up to that point will hold non-aligned speeches; the top third and the bottom third will each be drawn against each other within their third (a procedure known as the "*Gammel-Reitze Break*"). If the number of teams within a third is not even, the team with the lowest points in the upper third will speak against the team with the highest points in the lower third.

C.2.2 Elimination rounds

- a) *Qualification for elimination rounds:* The teams with the most points at the end of the preliminary rounds qualify for the first elimination round as factions. However, to do so they must not have changed their team members during the course of the preliminary rounds.⁴⁶ Should this nevertheless be the case, original team members may still take part in the elimination rounds as individual speakers, i.e. as non-aligned speakers, as long as all substituted team members met the competition criteria. In the event of a tie in points between teams or between individual speakers, the matter is decided by lot.
- b) *Seeding in elimination rounds:* The qualified team with the most points speaks in room 1 against the qualified team with the fewest points, the one with the second most points against the one with the second fewest points, etc. The non-aligned speakers are allocated to the rooms according to the order of their individual points; i.e. the person with the most points in room 1, the second highest in room 2, and so on. The position of the teams (government or opposition) and the order of the non-aligned speakers will be determined by lot, as in the previous rounds.
- c) *Advancement in elimination rounds:* In the elimination rounds, the qualification for the next round is decided by direct comparison between the factions. A tie is not possible here: should no team be ahead on points, or subsequently by a simple majority of the adjudicators, the main adjudicators must decide in favour of one team. The speakers with the highest number of points in a room who did not advance via their faction qualify as non-aligned speakers for the next round (in case of a tie, the current individual points decide). The remaining non-aligned speakers in the next round are made up of the best speakers who have not yet advanced according to individual points. Should there be a tie in points here, the matter is decided by lot.

C.2.3 Determination of the competition victory

- a) *Tables:* The scores awarded in each round and in each room are recorded centrally in tables. Speakers (with the total number of points for their individual performances) and teams (with the total number of points for their individual and team performances) are listed in one table, sorted by points. The person with the most points heads the table.
- b) *Competition victory without elimination rounds:* If only general rounds are held in a competition, the team with the most total points at the end of all rounds wins the competition and leads the table.

⁴⁶For the sake of fairness, the performance that qualifies for the competition victory should come from the team itself (and not from any substitutes), and ideally equally from all three team members (which is why full attendance is also expected in the elimination rounds).

- c) *Competition victory in elimination rounds*: If elimination rounds are held, the team that wins the last elimination round, the final, wins the competition.