

Observations to the Wendsay's debates

SPAIN 1 vs. THE NETHERLANDS 1

Today we appreciated the Spanish team members' practical approach to the topic submitted to them.

Interpreting 'Maria' permitted us to better understand one of the question points: beyond rules, proposals, orders, standard formulars there are persons.

This approach also made the exposition particularly lively.

The area of freedom, security and justice aimed by the EU shall not put in danger individual rights, therefore speediness of extradition might not justify the avoidance of mandatory grounds of refusal;

Executing Member State should be entitled, case by case, to check the respects of the fundamental rights and the general principles common to the EU; mandatory grounds for refusal restrict Judicial Athorities discretion and are functional both to HR respect and to speediness of judicial cooperation.

The Spanish team point of view was clearly and effectively expressed.

The English was fluent and we could appreciate the team work.

The Ducth team approach was a little more theoretical, but flexible, stressing on the need of approximation and elaborating minimum standards; mandatory grounds of refusal could give the way to political solutions. Conflicts between different interests eventually at stake should be solved at EU level.

Fluent English and team work.

SPAIN 2 vs. FRANCE 4

We appreciated the way the French group pointed out steps and criteria they used to solve the question submitted to them.

Fluent English and team work.

We particularly enjoyed the theoretical approach of the Spanish team and also the use of quotations from ECJ case law, and the lively exposition.

Fluent English and team work.

