

First Affirmative's Actions	First Negative's Actions	Your Actions
First Affirmative has already set out a clear funding model.	First Negative has simply ignored this fact and is hoping the adjudicators have, too.	Simply point out that First Negative is 'mistaken' (it's nicer than suggesting that he's clearly making things up or wasn't listening) and briefly reiterate how the funding mechanism works—it doesn't matter if the speaker is convinced, it's the adjudicator you're trying to remind.
First Affirmative has set out a funding model, but it was incomplete or confused.	First Negative is either confused or is taking advantage of the confusion and exaggerating it in the hope of getting more credit in the eyes of the adjudicator.	Refer to the funding model in your introduction, making sure to mention that it has already been addressed and clarify it in your rebuttal.
First Affirmative did not give a funding model but made clear that you would do so in your speech.	First Negative is taking advantage of the fact that your team hasn't put this important plank of your case into place yet.	In your roadmap, highlight that you will be dealing with funding during your speech. In your rebuttal, mention that First Affirmative had made clear that you would address the issue. Then, in the main body of your speech, set out the funding model in detail.
First Affirmative failed or forgot to mention funding and gave no indication of anybody else doing so either.	First Negative has spotted a major flaw in your case and has taken advantage of it.	In your introduction, roadmap the fact that you will deal with funding in your speech. In your rebuttal, challenge First Negative for not addressing the underlying principles behind your case and focusing instead on details of delivery (or something similar). Lay out a funding model in the main body of your speech.