A. counterinterpretation: the affirmative only needs to specify \_\_\_ if the spec interpretation of the negative is disclosed on the NDCA wiki at least an hour prior to the round.

Solves 100% of you abuse claim, if you disclose the shell on the wiki, then I can specify in the aff. But there are several NBs to my interp:

1. overspec bad – if I specified \_\_\_, it would be bad for the neg unless you had DAs or counterplans that varied based on alterations in \_\_\_ - it would be devastating since I could use what I spec-ed to get out of generic indicts. It’s net preferable for clash and real world education if I specified when you can use your prep, given that everyone does different work and it leads to more in-depth debates. Also key to fairness since it ensures mutually acceptable parameters for discussion. spec debates are irresolvable absent clear delineation of what you wanted spec-ed since it’s unclear how much prep/ground you actually lost or what would have happened. My interp promotes more substantive education since I don’t have to spec unless there is a clear expectation of what you wanted. It is stupid to expect the aff to predict what it is that will be useful for the negative to spec since different neg debaters will want different things clarified.

2. time skew – my CI has the NB of not wasting aff time spec-ing irrelevant things – kills 1ac time that’s already not enough given uplayering potential and neg strategy crafting advantage. It is unreasonable to expect the aff to spend a large portion of their AC specifying different things to provide the negative a link to any possible strategy.

My interp ensures I only spec relevant details of my advocacy and turns your offense since Specification trades off with itself. If I spend time specifying in my aff about the cost of the aff policy that trades off with time I can spend explaining how my standard operates or how the policy is implemented etc.