

4.1) We welcome any comments you wish to share about this conference (which plenary lecture was your favorite, suggestions you would make regarding future conferences, etc.)

- 1.3 I am a statistician, not a scientist. Exhibition of no professional interest to me except for publishers
- 1.4 I do not use social media for anything

The posters on the 2nd floor were out of the way of most delegates. A public announcement encouraging delegates to head that way would have been helpful.

online poster voting was flawed, nothing to stop spam voting.

program planning for fine debris analysis meant that sessions were missed. Should have spread them out a bit.

The locations of the presentations were too scattered, makes it a struggle for participants to run between locations. registration counter staff didn't seem to know a lot, especially when asked about directions and location

good lunch spread

good that posters were left for whole period.

classrooms for oral presentations were sometimes too stuffy and if the aircooler is on, it gets too noisy

organisers seemed to be very confident of the participants sense of direction. leaving participants after the study visit stunned without clear instructions

- 1 change of rooms - not properly announced or coordinated, participants could not find the rooms
 - 2 reception counter staff was not very helpful, e.g. could not pinpoint the location of the conference dinner on a map
 - 3 Themes - more systematic approach to organise by discipline, easier for participants
 - 4 oral presentations - too many parallel sessions
 - 5 Transportation between venues should be provided before and after workshop study visit
 - 6 Speakers - instruction to speaker is limited, do not know where/who to approach to save oral presentation. waited about 20 minutes for the lady with laptop to appear for his function
 - 7 Auditorium - too hot and stuffy
-

The agenda was very packed and often some of the workshops overlapped with lectures of some themes. The workshops may work better if on a different day/time to lectures. I am not sure this worked very well

-
- Physical Anthropology,
 - Forensic Entomology.
 - Questioned Document.
 - Cyber Criminality - (Multimedia Science).
 - Criminology science.
-

Eoghan Cosey & KP Inman

not to put similar topics in parallel

parallel topics should be as far as possible from each other from a content point of view

I especially enjoyed the lectures by Szijr
Palenik, very encouraging. I also enjoyed meeting
some of my heroes in TRACE EVIDENCE.
Through 2 occasions there was an overlap between
lectures in fibres evidence. It was only at
two blocks and hence I had to skip 3 of the 6
lectures in fibres evidence. Also ~~the~~ some of the
lectures felt in the wrong theme if you ask me.

Excellent conference! the venue was perfect and it was extremely
well organised. It is difficult to think of my best
Plenary lecture but my top 2 were the cognitive
talk and the art Plenary lecture. Some points for
the future: posters - it was difficult to find some
posters - and not always possible to download a
copy. could organisers take a photo of each +
put on the website instead of relying on scientists
to provide a pdf? (this may require an "opt out"
of course) and: email addresses; a complete
list of email contacts for all speakers on the
web site would be hugely useful, alongside

-
- 2. Best lectures: James Curran and Ian Everett
 - 3. Do not plan workshops at the same time as lectures.
 - 4. Randomness in determining winners for the best poster and for the forensic poetry contest.
-

It was not clear to the conference attendees when to turn up to the many poster sessions. (though it was very clear to me when I had to be at my poster).
Thoroughly enjoyed my time here.

too many parallel sessions
5 would have been maximum
→ more exposure to speaker
→ more interdisciplinary

I loved the actuality of the presentations, such as the Christchurch earthquake, Japan tsunami and Norway attacks. Especially the Norway presentations were very good and made a great impression on me !!!

1) moving between lectures extremely awkward because of lack of time and complex venue. I was left out one occasion because I was later (previous lecture went over time) and on 2 occasions because the room was full

2) problems with registration prevented me from going to the excursions I planned and registered for.

suggestion: do not try to secure as precisely most time - every delay will roll and cause problems

-
- Surnames could be spelled in full
 - There should be only one price including Conference Dinner for all - too many young participants didn't attend the dinner because they would have to pay it themselves
 - Press Codes should be given in advance
 - The number of posters per institution could be limited to, say 10...

- outstanding organisation: I really don't know a single thing to criticize
splendid even in the tiny details

- A really lovely conference which left behind a great first impression about NFI

Fabulous!

program very well organized - too many good lectures to choose from / overlapping made it difficult to select which one to go to.

The 5 minutes of transfer time planned to change session was a terrific idea. The American Academy of Forensic Science could get lessons from you!

I was delighted by the organization of the conference. NFI did a tremendous job

A single negative point: workshops at the same time as presentation was not convenient

many thanks for all

Improve administration (registration, visits, ...)

-
- conference should be smaller / fewer lectures
 - more interactive

-
- I prefer workshops with interaction instead of workshops with only presentations
 - very well organized conference!
 - wednesday afternoon visits of ICC, ICTY etc.: great!

Thank a lot for the beautiful days in The Hague!

TOO ~~MANY~~ PARALLEL SESSIONS / PRESENTATIONS

conference was too broad and unfocussed. Large number of parallel sessions made for a very complicated programme with less time for discussions with delegates. Venue was interesting but some exhibition space was too remote

My favourite plenary lecture was the
Microbiome and Artificial Intelligence in Digital
Forensics. It was very useful for us

In my opinion there was too many very
interesting lectures at the same time,
~~and~~ we were only two people from our institute,
I feel we missed a lot of information.

I am globally not very satisfied. I think you wanted to impress
people by being bigger than the best, which resulted in a weird
schedule, with thousands of parallel sessions. In the end, I only
went, or will attend to a total of 15-16 scientific presentations and
workshop, while I can attend to 20 per day (!) in a normal scientific meeting.
So, for the next time, please cut down protocol sessions and long
empty speeches, focus on science, make shorter time slots and reduce
the number of parallel sessions so we have a chance to actually attend to
more than a few presentations.

Reduce the number of parallel sessions as there were talks I could not attend due to clashes

Increase places on hall trips

To many interesting presentations at the same time forced me to make some difficult choices and made me miss some interesting presentations.

If attending a workshop, you'll miss many interesting presentations.

The workshops were not scheduled at an appropriate time → at the same time as lectures of the same theme

Please, open the coffee bar as soon as 0800 a.m. 😊

Don't schedule the workshop during the lecture of the same theme

I am very disappointed by the whole organisation of everything related to the posters. As someone who was presenting a poster I felt that they were left behind ~~and~~ and not much importance was put on them, with the sessions being at lunch people were more interested in eating. I also feel that the voting system was appalling; ~~over~~ essentially I put a lot of effort into my poster and to find out that it was a regularity contest and that each poster was not going to be judged on its individual merit shocked me. We put in the effort why couldn't you? The fact that anybody could vote from anywhere in the world meant you could ask people who hadn't even seen your poster to vote. This was made even clearer when the number of votes for the winner was announced ~~at 1000 or 10000~~ there were not that many people at the conference, therefore this system was evidently corrupt and unjust. As always, that's how science tries to avoid!

Some overlap in topics from speakers. Sometimes lectures on the same field of interest on the same time, which was a shame

place workshop, lectures outings/visits on separate days, as block of events so those who wish to ~~not~~ attend each block of every can do so. If not, he/she can leave early

staff didn't seem to know what was happening with conference, told one thing and then the exact opposite happens. e.g. told there would be no luggage storage when in fact there was but had already paid for storage

Auditorium wasn't large enough for numbers of people.
Very disappointing with closing ceremony

It would have been a very well organized evening conference
No conference should be being that the balance between too much too little going on was weighted in favour of too much for this conference.
I am not in favour of the workshops being run during the conference. There is too much of a sensation of being cut off if you participate.
I personally enjoyed some meetings so the issue of my content may be wrong. I have been of other work commitments.
Overall good but suggest fewer parallel sessions

I FELT THE ALLOCATION OF STUDY VISITS COULD OF BEEN BETTER ORGANISED
- DIDNT RECEIVE A VOUCHER FOR ANY STUDY VISIT EVEN THOUGH I ASKED TO
ATTEND NFI. ON THE DAY 40/80 PEOPLE ONLY ATTENDED (NO FAULT OF ORGANISERS
- BUT DELEGATES) AND I WAS THEN ALLOWED ATTEND (WHICH WAS GREAT- I WOULD
OF BEEN BITTERLY DISAPPOINTED). IN HINDSIGHT I WOULD OF REQUESTED
INTERESTED PARTICIPANTS COULD COLLECT VOUCHERS ON MORNING OF VISITS,
WHILE PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTING PASSPORT DETAILS.

-
- The time to go to another lecture was too short.
 - The time to wait in a long row at the desk was not ~~really~~ necessary
 - I couldn't ask anyone to show me where my class was; it would be nice if there were people, if you were lost, to show you were to go
 - The noise of the aircos! you could hardly listen to the orator.

THE LUNCH, BBQ, Dinners ~~were~~ were good!

loved the cartoonist!
Great.

Poster download stations didn't work?

Not every poster was available at the download station

Messy organisation. Too many parallel sessions making it difficult to attend. Abandoned after study visits with no support on return to hotel.

Plenary sessions too short due to many announcements and time to change venue - speakers unable to go into greater detail.

Too much multi-disciplinary focus resulting in lack of depth.

Rooms with no microphones for audience to ask questions.

Chaotic registration. Lack of QC - damaged lanyard and broken conference bag.

especially for those
new to back transfers

~~1.~~ To send the poster as a pdf-file and have it printed ^{out} would be an option. (to the organisers making it more convenient to travel. :-)

2. The beach party was fantastic! Food & dancing!!

3. There should be dancing and some time to chat after the conference dinner. This is the evening that you have gathered a "list" of persons that you really would like to talk to!

-
- ① Transport should be provided ~~for~~^{after} study visit. No instructions were given as to how to come back.
 - ② Staff at special desk were helpful but has no knowledge of where the rooms are as well as how to move from place to place. Example, does not know where the conference dinner is held.
 - ③ Some workshop are very interesting and refreshing e.g. forensics 2.0 - responding to a changing environment.
-

Too many interesting lectures and too many int. workshops were on same time.

very good scientific programme!

-
- Too many topics at the same time
 - Workshops in between prevented me to go to interesting presentations
 - Posters on so many levels and in too many places → impossible to follow it all up; impossible to vote since not all posters could be evaluated

Our payment/registration did not work
No visits could therefore be attended,
but we registered very early and
e-mailed a lot asking for ^{paid} confirmation.

A rough timeschedule would have
been good early; for booking travel
and hotels (start/ending early/late during
the day)

I would have liked a bit more
presentations about crime scene work/
firearms examiners work.

-
- 1) Speakers kept to time which enabled questions - Great!
 - 2) Tour of NFI was excellent - but I was lucky to be visiting labs of interest (would have been slightly sad if I had missed out; ask folk their options next time?)
 - 3) Great social events: and everybody-friendly!
-

- 1) WORKSHOPS SHOULD NOT OVERLAP TO ORAL PRESENTATIONS, BUT HAVE A SPECIFIC OWN AFTERNOON (OR MORE)
 - 2) IN SOME CASES, THE ORAL PRESENTATIONS WERE NOT OUTSTANDING AS FOR THE RESULTS, AND I THINK THAT IN THOSE CASES A POSTER WOULD BE MORE THAN ENOUGH
 - 3) I FOUND THE PLENARY LECTURE OF DROR REALLY INTERESTING AND FULL OF FASCINATING SUGGESTIONS
 - 4) I APPRECIATED THE WORKSHOP LED BY BKA TEAM OR BLOODY PRINTS
-

- THE CONFERENCE WAS VERY WELL ORGANISED AND IT SUCCEEDED VERY WELL
 - THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS IS DOING OUTSTANDING AND REMARKABLE WORK IN SUPPORTING FORENSIC RESEARCH
 - THE CSI THE HAGUE PROJECT IS GREAT AND WE IN FINLAND WANT TO COOPERATE WITH IT / NFI / NETHERLAND POLICE
 - PITY THAT WE NEED TO WAIT 3 YEARS FOR THE NEXT CONFERENCE
 - EXCURSIONS WERE GREAT - I AM JUST SORRY THAT I DID NOT GET A CHANCE TO VISIT EURO POL IL
 - WE ARE PLANNING TO VISIT THE HAGUE AGAIN BEFORE THE WINTER TO START FRESH NEW COOPERATION BETWEEN WITH THE NETHERLANDS AND FINLAND
-

It would be good to see some more
papers / sessions on Forensic Medicine.
The presentations on education & training
were very useful.
Toxicology would be another topic you
could have more of.

I found the conference very well organised and would like to con-
gratulate you for this. However, I found the thematic areas a bit
confusing and not well defined - so in the end it was more
useful to go through the program in detail to find points of
interest. Finally, I found the program too dense and too full -
it didn't leave time for discussion after lectures or networking time
in between.

Too many parallel sessions competing
with each other, so choices were
~~too~~ often between lectures/workshops
with similar themes/topics.
Also included conflicts with the
plenary lectures.
No real sense of a group of
people gathered together.

Favorite: lecture of DROR (too short!)

Too much things to do! makes you have to make choices.

maybe on the excursion day some presentations / workshops could be repeated.

Good conference! Looking forward to the next!

Very good organisation TY

Plenary session Kayser was very nice.

just one comment about place: it is quite a labyrinth!

sometime it was difficult to find the right way.

-
- Reduce queues at registration.
 - Reduce queues at buffet areas.
 - Give directions to designated lunch areas.
 - Put less salt in the food.
 - Provide directions back to conference, after study visit.
 - Provide transport back to conference.
 - Turn on a/c during hot weather.
 - Parallel sessions are too short to go in-depth.
 - Visits to institutes should have guided tours, not just lectures in the buildings.
 - coffee/tea should be available throughout
 - give handouts during the sessions.

My favourite lecture/workshop was: R. Schoning, Do more forensic work in less time? ... It was brilliant! ☺

My worst experience was the busy hot bus to the City Hall.
I almost died - seriously! ☹

I missed the lunch the first day since it was not announced in the program - that was a pity!

The beach party was really great. I enjoyed it a lot as well as the

I would also like to attend any Coming Conferences of forensic science.

This conference reminded me why I am in forensic science. It has inspired me to stay in this field and look for opportunities.

The speakers were all relevant and the information was fresh.

My favourite aspect was the multidisciplinary approach.

The visit to Europol was also a highlight.

My favourite lectures were from Manfred Kayser and Ido Dror.

Thank you for a wonderful experience

A map with the locations of posters with specific themes would have been helpful. Also a formal poster presentation time would be better as many people extended their lunch rather than go to the poster session.

Workshops very good.

Missed some information about lunch and what companies and posters had to end their sessions before the end of the conference.

Favourite plenary lecture: Eoghan Casey.
Least favourite: Bob Reed (mostly very basic concepts)

Visit to Europol was a bit disappointing. The two speeches were alright, but could as well have been held at the conference venue. No demo; we just got to see an (admittedly impressive) conference hall.

I'd like some more presentations on digital forensics both technical as well as legal/ethical (privacy aspect).

more attention for the poster (sessions)
no break up of sponsor stands during the conference
no pre registration for the visits (lot of people did not show up and others really wanted to go, but did not have a ticket)

- Try to schedule workshops at different times than related presentations
- Could have informed us earlier that desired visits could not be organized (of course everybody wanted to go to the NFI) • Got 2017, did not attend and could not "give my seat" to someone else.
- Poster numbering? WT..?
- Otherwise, great organization (before and during the conference)
Good job!

The study visits could have been organized better. I understand about difficulties w/ passport numbers ~~and~~ ^{and that} ~~people~~ not everybody could go but ~~and~~ I don't think there was a suitable alternative programme (apart from a few very specialistic workshops) for the ones that stayed behind. Also, practical information could have been provided in a better way. The end time of the visit (Europeal, which I went to) was not clear. This caused ~~very~~ difficulties in logistics (also w/ the planning of our booth as ~~the~~ sponsor) which could have easily been avoided had I known that the visit lasted till 14.30 in stead of 17/17.30. Stated on the ~~page~~ posters in the hall. Please ensure clear communication! Also very important: there was no coffee after 08.30! Late-comers who didn't go to the plenary speakers were not received in a pleasant way I think -...

Go And See How Well Other Power Users Are Doing!!

Where Is the Security?

Excellent - Thanks for all the hard-work

NETWORKING OPPORTUNITIES WERE LIMITED A LITTLE BY
CONSTANTLY MOVING AROUND SITE TO DIFFERENT ROOMS

USE OF TWITTER\FACE BOOK GREAT

ORGANISATION OF LUNCH NOT GREAT.

OVERALL SATISFIED. NFI VERY IMPRESSIVE

The ideas of interdisciplinary themes was very interesting, but I haven't found
a lot of crossing-boundaries talks or discussions.

- It would be nice to have the opportunity to have a question round after the
Plenary talks or Keynotes, I hope that the opportunity created on LinkedIn to
discuss with the speakers online will be used by participants.
- Very good organisation, thank you!

It's too bad the way the poster selection took form. I don't
understand how someone can have 100 votes, even though
there were only 650 participants! Apparently the 2.0
stage cannot be implemented without the fair
participation of people!

Also too bad the workshops ^{were} during the confe-
rences, they should have been given on Monday
and Wednesday afternoon.

This was my first EAFs conference but certainly not my last! It kind of feels like 'home' here.

-
- poor ~~main~~ catering
 - badly organized. separate and insufficient catering for Exhibitors.
 - few posters many missing

LOVELY FOOD,
LONG REGISTRATION QUEUE
MORE TRIPS TO ICE WOULD BE GOOD
EXCELLENT SOCIAL PROGRAM

workshops parallel to lectures are not very helpful, because you miss interesting lectures or interesting workshops

I greatly appreciated the variety of workshops, so there were lots of interesting themes.

workshops unfortunately were too short; you have to have more time when you are doing hands-on workshops

I'd appreciate workshops before or after the conference

There were lots of interesting talks parallel, so even if I wanted, I was just able to hear the ones in my own working field. Perhaps more detailed abstracts would

The last plenary lecture was my favourite.

Too many sessions at the same time

The food was very good!

Perhaps in a future conference, a platform could be made where job opportunities, traineeships, exchange positions etc. could be advertised.

Far too long time to wait for food...
I've never been so hungry at a conference
No fruit on coffee break!
Difficult to find lunch - no information.
~~Was too long time to wait for food...~~

Organization was extremely well done. Workshops really shouldn't be interspersed with the overall program, in my opinion. Choices are appreciated but some workshops effectively took up whole 1/2 days which eliminated every other possibility. Some of the 1 hour workshops were fine but the extended ones should be put on separate days.

The EAFS conference was very well organized and the service was excellent!!

There was a problem with my payment and the communication via email was poor. Due to this issue I did not get to go on any visits organized by the EAFS.

Too many parallel sessions, several times I missed lectures due to timetable clashes.

8:30 very early to commence plenary lectures.

Really not the quality of biology/molecular genetics presenters, posters & research names that I would have expected for such a big conference - the research quality was lacking for most this particular area.

Shouldn't be organising field visits when there are less than 10% of EAFS participants can actually attend due to restrictions on numbers.

my favourite was from Dr Dor. The amount of sessions could be reduced, sometimes it was overwhelming!