



**ACPO Professional Standards**  
**Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> – Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2008**

**Responses to Conference Evaluation Form**

*Note: 116 completed evaluation forms were returned, some delegates did not respond to all questions – some gave more than one response to a question i.e. question Q5 – the number of responses for each question is recorded.*

**Conference Structure**

**Q1: How satisfied were you with the overall conference style and structure?** *Total Numbers of answers 116*

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very Satisfied	47	40.5
Satisfied	66	56.9
Dissatisfied	3	2.6

**Comments**

- “I felt that none of the morning sessions (day 1) added any value to my understanding of the issues raised. The interactive exercise was aimed at a tactical level and did not explore the more strategic organisational learning that perhaps provides alternatives to the expensive traditional responses discussed”
- “Hydra sessions too lengthy and too much emphasis on setting the scene for core values (accepting not all delegates are Professional Standard Personnel)”
- “Scenarios too rushed. 10,000 volts does not give time to review others comments”
- “The paper feed exercise on day 1 was entertaining but a bit rushed and lacked time to think enough about some important issues”
- “Too many single issue main sessions”
- “Not sure that Hydra is appropriate”
- “Would have liked more on future issues such as the Taylor pilots and evaluation”
- “Room on table a little tight. Hydra excellent”
- “Hydra a good venture”
- “Satisfied - opportunity for more fringe group sessions”
- “Enjoyed the discussions with colleagues, the Hydra prompting the discussions”
- “Good theme, running through much debate”
- “Don’t expect to pay the rates and find 3/4 hour with nothing to do.! Vetting morning needed interesting features and case studies not tedious recital of power point presentations.”
- “A little slow and information light this year”
- “Excellent, very professional, addressed key issues”
- “Some of the feedback sessions were painful and felt like going through the motions”
- “Well organised and structured”
- “Should have swapped the tables round a few times to increase circulation”
- “The Hydra was a bit over-done although little analysis / feedback on responses.”

- “Good use of interactive presentation provoking same interesting dialogue”
- “The theme concept is useful and enables conference to consider current and future issues”
- “Day 2 should have started with an inter-active exercise again. This would have generated issues and questions that would have made any subsequent speeches more relevant.”
- “Keep 10000 VOLTS but include more verbal debate on topics”
- “Yes, OK, it works to people who know their way around the methodology”
- “Although working in teams was the aim - the table layout did not enable this and discussion was compressed”
- “Increase workshops next time. Interactive Hydra was valuable - only observation would be to structure content of Day 1 sessions more formally e.g. risk assessments/ prioritise incidents/information and reward reasons”
- “The Hydra system was an excellent way of everyone contributing to the conference. The main topics around corruption and vetting raised some interesting points”
- “Paper feed exercise on Day 1 was extremely good”
- “Better than last year. Good interactive scenario”
- “The Hydra exercise was better than others I have attended”
- “Well structured and impactful”
- “Hydra Interactive Session - too much content in short time meant we were not able to get into detail and discuss some core issues that were raised and seek solutions. Would have liked more presentation/debate re. key strategic issues affecting police PSD currently - fringe groups catered for some of this”
- “Enjoyed the format of the first day”
- “The interactive style exercise was too long”

**Q2: How satisfied were you with the overall conference content?** *Total Numbers of answers 116*

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very Satisfied	35	30.2
Satisfied	74	63.8
Dissatisfied	7	6.0

**Comments**

- "I didn't come last year but understood it was speakers/presentations. The content this year was really good but maybe too much information and interaction (10,000 volts) Can we see the raw material in a post event pack."
- "Fringe group concept is an excellent idea and should continue, but I found this years fringe groups disappointing."
- "I came to the conference 2 years ago, which I felt was heavy going, this time it was much better and more relevant to my role on ACU."
- "I would have preferred more formal presentations. The paper feed exercise was too long and the time spent could have been better spent with more informative presentations."
- "Generally not what I expected of an ACPO Professional Standards Conference."
- "Time spent on Hydra could have better been spent on more availability and chose to attend the varied workshops."
- "Hornby scenario too simple - provoked no debate."
- "Very simplistic. Are there any subject matter experts within this work?"
- "Good to see firming of link between PSD and vetting."
- "I would have preferred to attend more fringe groups and had less time spent on interactive sessions."
- "The use of hydra could be more strategic. The case study was interesting, but not taxing (day 1). Same exercise (day 2) Use of hydra system re comments – good."
- "10,000 volts is an excellent system and allows us quieter ones to have a voice."
- "The use of Hydra could be a bit distracting at times. The fringe groups were more valuable than the Hydra."
- "Consider input of current issues."
- "Will be interested to see how the issues drawn out in the first morning sessions are brought together. Good initiative, however I felt that there should have been some structure and management to the process."
- "There shouldn't be time to spare at an experienced conference."
- "Having had to forego some of the workshops I would rather have had their content in the second day rather than moving everything forward for a fast getaway."
- "Got some good points out of the 2 days."
- "Opening lost its thread, workshops very good."
- "The vetting scenario seemed a little basic."
- "Fringe groups useful. Interactive interesting but only raised questions without agreeing the key strategic issues."
- "Paper feed on day 1 took up too much of conference time. Need to be able to share key issues from all the fringe group sessions."
- "Few case studies would have been useful."

- “10000 VOLTS delivery was very good style in delivering themes but I felt scenarios were too basic and I do not believe the conference should be used for identifying ways to investigate corruptive issues.”
- “Everything was pitched at a superficial level and didn't seem to either ask the tough questions or provide and solutions.”
- “2nd day devalued by undue haste to change programme to finish.”
- “Being new to Professional Standards Department, content was very useful in getting a broad understanding of the issues.”
- “The use of 10000 VOLTS is a very useful tool but the time given for the interactive exercises did not allow sufficient opportunity for further discussion about other group inputs.”
- “Too much time spent on vetting.”
- “Good input between general PSP issues and the focus on force vetting.”
- “Around the 'theme' chosen, the structure of inputs was logical, comprehensive and informative.”
- “Most of the major points covered”
- “First day better than second.”
- “Relatively new to role - provided a good insight into key threats etc.”
- “Too much time was given over to the exercise on both days for the value gained. I would have liked more time to visit an additional fringe group or for more of the fringe groups to be core presentations.”
- “As the theme was anti corruption, would like to have seen more input/debate around SOCA threat assessment. Didn't think interactive sessions on day 1 added anything of particular value (although not entirely without merit) overall missed opportunity - fringe groups were good.”
- “A bit too heavy on vetting and didn't like Hydra exercise.”
- “Some of the speakers needed to be more dynamic in their delivery.”
- “More fringe content would have been beneficial.”
- “Very relevant to everyday issues.”
- “I appreciate the technical issues but a Hydra terminal each would have produced even more debate. Some visibly hung back and left comments to those more fluent on it or a stronger character in the group.”

**Q3: How satisfied were you with the presentations?** *Total Numbers of answers 114*

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very Satisfied	22	19.3
Satisfied	85	74.6
Dissatisfied	7	6.1

**Comments**

- “A bit more detail would be better.”
- “The input from the Cabinet Office was not particularly useful.”
- “The case study would have been better if there had been greater discussion and debate in relation to the prioritisation of the intelligence feed and how this would drive operational behaviour.”
- “Too much paper feed on Day 1 and not enough time to discuss the issues.”
- “Content and quantity of presentations improved on Day 2 with more vision about how issues are being developed. Mike Cunninghams delivery was generally uninspiring and generally ‘the same old thing’.”
- “The fringe groups were very good and the dry subject of vetting was made more clear and interesting.”
- “Some were poor and badly supported with visuals.”
- “Fine, but again where were the challenging, thought provoking presentations.”
- “Would have liked more good practice being identified and discussed.”
- “Some slides very difficult to see. Lighting on stage required.”
- “Again, I feel the content and discussions held at the fringe groups were far more beneficial. Disappointed that there were not many speakers.”
- “Some subjects - very dry.”
- “Mixed bag - Home Office presentation very poor and political.”
- “Excellent fringe group sessions, where there was opportunity to network and establish where my force sits in comparison with others. Good practice and lessons learnt from others.”
- “Cabinet officer speaker - content poor.”
- “Morning of day 2 was poor.”
- “Some good presentations.”
- “Vetting good.”
- “ACAG - Walking the Tightrope - poor content, lack of knowledge of covert policing. Vetting Risk Management - General input Interesting SIA Issues, interesting more direction and command, less stats and unknowns.”
- “I liked the Hydra input to copy ideas/comments.”
- “Vetting speakers on Day 2 did a good job with ‘dry’ material.”
- “The vetting presentations could have been more focussed on key issues and less general background/information.”
- “Some of the speakers needed to be more dynamic in their delivery.”
- “Interesting and relevant.”
- “Vetting presentations very informative and raised profile and subject. Hydra was very effective in producing questions for response after the talk.”

- “I did not find the case study very useful, whilst interesting not sure I learned very much. I found the fringe group topics the most useful and would like to have gone to 4 rather than 2. Management vetting and aftercare - speaker spoke too slowly and I lost all interest in the subject.”
- “Informative and engaging.”
- “As ever the presentations varied in quality but they linked together well.”
- “Vetting exercise was only down point. Unclear what the learning was meant to be and if the answer to sheet one was 'don't accept' the other two feeds were irrelevant. Would have preferred a case study presentation here of a more complex case, or a scenario which gives more of a choice..”
- “I felt that more information and knowledge was gained through the fringe group activities.”
- “Titles of Fringe Groups were misleading and content restricted. It would have been better to have table proposals on invited comments and ideas and labelled item as such if that was intended. The seminar I attended were not particularly slick and did not flow due to the fact that the agendas of facilitators and attendees were not consistent. I felt that if I had known what would have occurred in the seminar I attended I would have attended others instead which I was seriously considering along with those I attended. Opportunity to attend those fringe groups would have been appreciated.”
- “Presentation from DCC Cunningham lost its way, nothing visual to look at. Vetting transformations was too long and complicated and should not have been put on the agenda.”
- “Very satisfied with day 1. In day two the focus on vetting was an essential choice. However, Michael Shrayne's policy focus was not needed. His Home Office policy approach demonstrated exactly why the issue remains unchanged. Ownership needed. Clarity of standards. Paper feed too basic. Bob Varey from the heart but again too basic.”
- “Too much emphasis on vetting although very important I do not believe input from Cabinet Office was required as it did not provide any value to previous presentation.”
- “There haven't been any that have enlightened me.”
- “Presentations create debate, why not debate issues verbally?”

**Q4a: Which fringe group sessions did you attend?**

Session 1 Total Numbers of answers 107

Fringe Group	No of Responses	%
Service Confidence, taint	19	17.8
Inappropriate association	29	27.1
IPCC Stock take – the results	7	6.5
Taylor Pilots	28	26.2
Unauthorised disclosure	11	10.3
Force vetting versus national security	13	12.1

**Q4b: How satisfied were you with the content of these sessions?**

Total Numbers of answers 107

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very Satisfied	51	47.7
Satisfied	49	45.8
Dissatisfied	7	6.5

Session 2 Total Numbers of answers 99

Fringe Group	No of Responses	%
Service Confidence, taint	30	30.3
The vetting quiz	10	10.1
IPCC Performance & framework	4	4.1
Taylor reforms	23	23.2
HMIC Self inspection tool	12	12.1
Reporting wrong doing	20	20.2

**Q4b: How satisfied were you with the content of these sessions?**

Total Numbers of answers 99

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very Satisfied	40	40.4
Satisfied	49	49.5
Dissatisfied	10	10.1

**Comments**

- “Wide ranging discussion - too rushed - some valuable points discussed.”
- “Inappropriate association turned into a criticism of forces without policies. Could have been better if more focussed on the issues rather than if a policy will resolve the problem.”
- “Excellent, well delivered and very useful.”
- “Whilst the fringe group was lively and well facilitated the content did not reveal anything new and just re-visited the age old issues - tiresome!”
- “Lots of questions raised which was interesting and discussions were lively.”
- “Session 1 certainly brought up a relevant debate about individuals view of what is inappropriate. Session 2 was useful in clarifying the process that is to be adopted.”

- “There were several fringe sessions that I would have liked to attend so I trust that there will be some effective reporting via the relevant website.”
- “Very simple, very useful.”
- “Good sessions, well presented.”
- “Good space and numbers, ability to interact and exchange views.”
- “Surprised at the lack of knowledge around service confidence.”
- “Workshops such as these provide a valuable opportunity to share best practice - often a better way than speakers on a formal agenda.”
- “Seemed to be discussion groups in respect of Taylor implementation rather than HMIC.”
- “Taylor reforms in particular was very helpful/enlightening session.”
- “1) Not the best facilitator of debate, but good debate held - not clear what outcomes will follow      2) Very good update. Could have covered the cultural change required and given some guidance re that work.”
- “Session 2 hampered by fewer delegates but quickly restructured”
- “Vic Marshall should have been given time in conference. Such an important issue should have featured with conference.”
- “I found these sessions the most informative and I gained most from these particular sessions.”
- “Headings were misleading and did not fully describe the agenda's of facilitators.”
- “Frustrated at continuing lack of ownership and progress in moving this forward - I wish Simon Cole well! Vic Marshall's presentation matures like a fine wine!”
- “Session 2 - Forces appear to be going to an enormous effort without results.”
- “Most there were from the Counter Corruption arena but I felt that both were pitched as the lowest common denomination and were essentially conversations that we had 2 years ago within regional ACCAG.”
- “Both a bit 'so what'”
- “A little longer would have been useful as the very good content generated a lot of questions but I do recognise the difficulties.”
- “Good discussion although in Session 1 it became very confusing as to the different interpretations.”
- “Need to address issue vetting of police staff a little more. Discussion was very police-officer and police conduct regulation based.”
- “Both interesting subjects that show a wide and varied difference across the country in how subjects are dealt with and the views of ACPO.”
- “Excellent. Good quality stuff - pity no time to attend more than 2!”
- “Too many major sessions of single issues of no interest. Should be opportunity to cover more of the fringe - run them twice.”

**Q5a: Please specify your main purpose / reason for attending the conference and rate your satisfaction on whether the event met this criteria**

Total Numbers of answers 170

Reason	No of Responses	%
Information	73	42.9
Update	63	37.1
Networking	34	20.0

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very Satisfied	34	31.2
Satisfied	71	65.1
Dissatisfied	4	3.7

**Comments**

- "Update on PSD matters."
- "Main purpose was to learn about strategic issues that had surfaced during the past 12 months - the dilemmas experienced by chief officers and how they have shaped policy and process."
- "New in post and it was felt that this conference would be beneficial."
- "I am new to role upon ACU so at this stage all inputs/conferences are very useful. I have numerous questions for my force."
- "New in post - picked up a lot of information and raised even more questions. Made some useful contacts."
- "Good mix of plenary and networking opportunities."
- "I believe that all opportunity was lost to improve maximum information, particularly during the interactive sessions on the day."
- "Networking/update re Taylor."
- "All three reasons really."
- "The view of ACPO is important to all officers. It is worthy of noting that not all agencies agree with ACPO on all subjects. ACPO are not always correct!"
- "Always good to renew acquaintances' of relevance and make new ones. Useful to on crucially important (and sometimes frightening issues)."

**Q6: How satisfied were you with the booking process?**

Total Numbers of answers 113

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very Satisfied	76	67.3
Satisfied	37	32.7
Dissatisfied	0	0.0

**Comments**

- "All went very well."
- "Excellent communication, clear instructions."
- "The event team were very good. Efficient, friendly etc."
- "Excellent, very friendly and helpful."
- "Very efficient - booked me in on the 11<sup>th</sup> to attend session on 12<sup>th</sup>"
- "Process was very responsive when I needed to change hotel accommodation requirements (from 1 to 2 nights) at relatively short notice."
- "Difficult to get room key upon arrival."
- "Slight confusion re directions from airport (not included) due to construction work."
- "Secretary dealt with - not aware of any difficulty."
- "Very well run conference."
- "First class."
- "Excellent, booked late with no issues."
- "Booked overnight on the Tuesday because last year on day 1 there was no car parking left. On this occasion on day 1 there was lots of spare spaces!"

**Q7: How did you find the organisation of the conference when on site?** *Total Numbers of answers 114*

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very Satisfied	87	76.3
Satisfied	26	22.8
Dissatisfied	1	0.9

**Comments**

- “Poor room/booking procedure. 1st and 3rd floor both insisted it was the others responsibility.”
- “Ground organisation good.”
- “I do feel that staff are not sufficiently equipped to deal with such a large group of people.”
- “CJS Events - very helpful, thank you.”
- “Hotel couldn’t cope with large numbers.”
- “Radisson Pens – Rubbish.”
- “Very smooth.”
- “I thought that the venue was excellent.”
- “Food on first night inadequate, better in previous years when there was a) a choice of food and b) opportunity to upgrade meal.”
- “Excellent.”
- “First class.”
- “Very easy to follow, very well laid out, aids interesting networking and promoted relevant conversation.”
- “Very adequate and easy to access. On the one hand a change would be good - on the other, why fix it if it isn't broken!”

**Q8: How satisfied were you with the conference venue?** *Total Numbers of answers 115*

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very Satisfied	70	60.9
Satisfied	39	33.9
Dissatisfied	6	5.2

**Comments**

- “Facilities restricted, very expensive bar.”
- “Not sure that it represented value for money.”
- “Lunch in Runway Brasserie was not particularly hot. Hotel rooms badly need refurbishment.”
- “Excellent venue for travelling.”
- “Good facilities but very expensive drinks. Food poor except main banquet.”
- “A very good venue.”
- “All needs catered for.”
- “Far too expensive.”
- “Good venue, good location, good facilities.”
- “A conference of this nature should avoid being held in a busy hotel with significant public throughput. Advice to avoid loose talk was absent from conference briefings.”
- “Should be allowed to book into your room before 5pm.”
- “Extremely good venue.”
- “Expensive.”
- “Easy access from airport, very welcome, good comfortable room, food fine.”
- “Location poor - absolutely nothing outside hotel. Hotel is very expensive right from accommodation rates to the price of a drink. Been here a number of times - time to move on.”
- “Expensive bar!”
- “Ideal for travel and accommodation.”
- “Food was always tepid, menus not great.”
- “Excellent location and facility.”
- “Excellent venue.”
- “Isolated hotel in the middle of an airport extremely restrictive for evening.”
- “Good for rail and other transport networks.”
- “The quality of the food is quite poor for the venue and the bar prices are simply extortionate!”
- “Not a great hotel, a little cramped in conference.”

**Q9: If you have attended previous ACPO conferences how did the location compare?** *Total Numbers of answers 85*

Rating	No of Responses	%
Very favourably	29	34.1
Comparably	35	41.2
Very unfavourably	3	3.5
N/A	18	21.2

**Comments**

- “Came to same venue last time.”
- “Close to Air and Rail links.”
- “Not as good as Hinkley.”
- “First ACPO conference.”
- “Cant comment as this was my first.”
- “Last 4 have all been here!”
- “As a resident of Manchester it is a good location. However, I feel better venues are available in the Midlands i.e. Stratford Manor.”

**10: As a result of hotel refurbishment, next year’s conference will be held elsewhere. What would be your preferred location?** *Total Numbers of answers 100*

Rating	No of Responses	%
North East	7	7.0
North west	12	12.0
Midlands	41.0	41.0
East	2	2.0
South East	20	20.0
South West	11	11.0
Scotland	5	5.0
Wales	2	2.0

**Comments**

- “No preference, but venue near airport would be helpful.”
- “No view.”
- “Not bothered.”
- “No preference.”
- “Anywhere with good transport networks.”
- “No preference - I'll be back!”

**Q11: By which means of transport did you travel to the conference?** *Total Numbers of answers 115*

Rating	No of Responses	%
Train	19	16.5
Aeroplane	28	24.3
Car*	68	59.1
Bus	0	0.0
Walk	0	0.0

**Q11b: \* If by car did you travel with other colleagues?**

Total Numbers of answers 68

Rating	No of Responses	%
Yes	31	45.6
No	37	54.4

**Q11: \* If yes how many?**

Total Numbers of answers

Rating	No of Responses	%
1	18	58.1
2	8	25.8
3	5	16.1
4	0	0.0
5+	0	0.0

**Q12: ACPO would like delegates' input into future events in terms of content and themes that you would like to see addressed. Please provide any suggestions below:**

- "HMIC Inspections due for PSD's next year - HMIC input would be useful."
- "How to improve Professional Standards within a climate of finite funding and resourcing."
- "Tackling high volume professional standards issues."
- "Anti Corruption and future thinking on Operatives, intelligence and its management."
- "Performance Measurement. Approach to Taylor one year on."
- "1. Update on new procedures for conduct. 2. Update on service confidence 3. Good practice identified and discussed around key topics."
- "Pre-read suggestions - have delegates bring answers/concerns e.g. what 3 issues are causing you concern now."
- "Taylor - how has the introduction gone. The IPCC changes to the complaint system."
- "Vetting needs to stay on the agenda."
- "Previously identified good practices within a force/forces could be shared to all as some are ahead of others e.g. Inappropriate Association Policy (apparently 75% of forces don't have a policy)."
- "Taylor - progress thus far. Employment Tribunals - Role - Could they undermine the discipline process?"
- "Anti-corruption investigation. Substance misuse."
- "Training of PSD/AC Investigators and accreditation."
- "Conduct matters in compensation claims."
- "Case studies are often effective and informative."
- "Continue with corruption theme case studies."
- "Difficult case studies."
- "An agreement for National Coordination on Policy."
- "Perhaps more focus groups. Less 10,000 volts."
- "The impact of the new Performance and Conduct Regulations on Forces."
- "Vetting - promotion vetting - Association. Tying them all together and establishing management and aftercare. Do we need RIPA for Misconduct?"
- "Career development for staff."
- "Part of the conference should be an update of previous conferences where issues raised have led to change in policy procedure nationally. This would give attendees a belief that issues identified at conference was bought to a successful outcome and delivered change."
- "Service Confidence - follow up on action since this years fringe meeting. Changing Culture. Citizen focussed policing/public confidence."
- "Topical events around this time next year and the impact of Taylor reforms."
- "I would have expected to see more input regarding the Taylor reforms."
- "Maximising IT security using proactive audit to maximise misuse and information leakage. The role of collaboration in enforcement intelligence and prevention of corruption."
- "Expansion of the fringe discussions to create a more complete product for ACPO Committee to consider e.g. why 43 Service Confidence policies, why not one?"

- “Too early for topical subjects but updates on elements of PSD toolbox i.e. drugs testing and vetting would be good.”
- “Continue with corruption - aspect remains important.”
- “Early lessons from Taylor implementation. Vetting - focus on aftercare with scenarios/examples of effective processes and results? Evidence of credit crunch on staff/recruits.”
- “Fitness for interview or attendance at a panel.”
- “Serial complaints and role of IPCC. Serial abuse and effect on police service.”
- “Paper feed more suited to small focus groups on range of topics.”
- “Taylor, post implementation.”
- “Quality outside agency speaker.”
- “Maintain focus on vetting.”
- “Maintain a focus on anti-corruption work and more use of interactive case studies.”
- “New discipline regulations will be online at next conference. A full update to promote good practise and share knowledge would be a subject worthy of some time. Post incident procedures.”
- “To take away from this conference a re-affirmation of my enduring thoughts that unless and until we get 'vetting' and 'supervision' right and sorted then all the other endeavours will never sort the major problems. Vetting needs to be clear and documented. To do a 'supervision' input at a PSD conference is perhaps unpalatable and not sufficiently 'sexy'.

**Q13: How did you hear about the conference?** *Total Numbers of answers 114*

Rating	No of Responses	%
Police Professional	4	3.5
Crisis response magazine	0	0.0
Email	44	38.6
Internally	66	57.9

**Comments**

- “Invite from Head of PSP.”
- “Invited to attend by the Force Head of PSD.”
- “Attended last year.”
- “Attended previously.”
- “Have been to the past five/six and am on Mr West's PSD (ACPO) Committee.”

**Q14: How do you rate the price of the conference?** *Total Numbers of answers 106*

Rating	No of Responses	%
Too Expensive	35	33.0
Value for money	71	67.0
Undervalued	0	0.0

**Q15: Any other comments / suggestions:**

- “I was amazed with the dress code for the gala dinner, why did you specify a cocktail dress for women. This is a little at odds with overall diversity driven. I know one woman who bought a dress and others who felt pressured to do so. Surely a dress code of smart/suits would be more diverse and doesn't single out women.”
- “Would have liked opportunity to attend more of the fringe group sessions. There were some very interesting sessions that I would have found very beneficial to attend.”
- “Need to attract more attendance from police authority members, especially as anti-corruption and vetting do involve serious resource/finance implications.”
- “I think event dinner should have a speaker.”
- “Simon Cole speaking on vetting presented well and was informative. That apart, the quality of presentations were not high.”
- “Pity no after dinner speaker especially as guest in room. No loyal toast.”
- “Speaker during conference dinner – professional / leader / experienced storyteller / comic.”
- “I would have preferred more fringe group input.”
- “Too expensive bearing in mind, time on hands.”
- “It is disrespectful to leave early. Maybe it should be stressed that delegates should stay for the duration.”
- “Hydra exercise lacked clarity of purpose/objective. I question why we did it- we were not attending a PSD training course.”

- “My only criticism of the conference is that the evening meal was consistently poor (this is my third conference and there has been no improvement.”
- “Don’t know cost - booked by my force. - Since found out and I think it was expensive for a public service conference (but cheaper conferences have had lesser hotel facilities sometimes).”
- “Do we really need to say a prayer before the dinner, it is outdated.”
- “Enjoyed it thanks.”
- “Feel there is value for money, but is exceptionally expensive.”
- “Great location, well organised. More live case structured demonstrating the threat, our vigour and investigative process within PSP.”
- “Doesn't seem to know what its audience is. Chief officers, unit heads and practitioners.”
- “Hotel location and standard may be a major factor in cost that could be reduced.”