

Sophie Jarrett
County Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Strategic Coordinator
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Prism House
Davy Way
Waterwells Business Park
Gloucester
GL2 2AD

28th March 2024

Dear Sophie,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report ('Ms A') for Forest Dean Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 24th January 2024. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

The QA Panel raised that there are good acknowledgments at the very start of the report, and a portrait of the victim from the family, which helps to put the victim and family at the heart of the report. The Panel noted that the recommendation for the victim's child to have access to the review once at an age of understanding was positive, again signifying that the victim and family are being kept at the centre of the review.

The review itself seems fair and balanced, centred on the victim and her experiences with services and domestic abuse. The report is written sensitively and shows a strong understanding of the issues faced by the victim, including by recognising how these could have been better handled by the agencies she was in contact with. There is also a good discussion of economic abuse in the analysis, and appropriate representation from the local domestic abuse service on the panel.

The QA Panel felt that there are some aspects of the report which may benefit from further revision. The QA Panel suggest that the DHR should not be published in full and only a learning summary should be published due to the possible emotional impact on the children.

Areas for final development:

- A pseudonym should be given to the victim, as 'Ms A' reads too clinically.

- A pseudonym should have been chosen for the partner. It makes the reading of the report difficult and raises questions on whether 'partner' is the correct term to use.
- Condolences and thanks should be offered to the family of the deceased within the review.
- Footnote 12, paragraphs 3.3.4 and 4.210 reveal the sex of the victim's child, compromising anonymity.
- Page 82 in the action plan uses the initials GW, possibly referring to the victim.
- At 1.10.4, more detail is needed on the rationale for not contacting the victim's partner.
- At 1.12.3, more detail is needed on when the Chair last worked with the areas mentioned.
- The dissemination list should include child social services, as they have been asked to hold a copy on file.
- At 2.2.5, the history becomes confused. The transition in the explanation of the victim's circumstances around when her child was born needs to be reworked, particularly as there is a suggestion there was domestic abuse perpetrated by the child's father.
- At 3.7.2, there is reference to the victim's child's 'bizarre' behaviour after they shared concerns for their mother. The language reads as insensitive.
- To note at 4.2.1, there is software to support GPs with screening for domestic abuse (IRIS). This could be investigated as an option in the action plan.
- Disability and gender are listed within the equality and diversity section of the review. This should be explored in more detail. There is a lack of information/facts regarding the deceased's diagnosis and previous adverse experiences which have contributed to potential barriers of support. The review may have also benefited from a specialist in the mental health sector. A rationale as to why a specialist was not considered should be included in the report.
- Comments throughout the report indicate that the deceased suffered abuse while pregnant. As pregnancy and maternity is a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010, this should be explored further in the equality and diversity section and should include statistics.
- There is some good understanding of economic abuse. This could be strengthened by also recognising that Ms A told professionals in April 2021 she had stopped working; alongside the concerns her bank account had been

hacked. It would also be helpful to include a learning point for economic abuse in the analysis, and for it to also be included in the executive summary, as has been done for other forms of abuse. The use of research (for example, the Sharp-Jeffs and Learmonth report listed in the bibliography) could also be used to explore what the impact of the economic abuse may have been on Ms A.

- The report would be strengthened by including further analysis of the impact of COVID-19 and the lockdown, especially the impact of services moving to remote consultations and engagement.
- The Overview section is very long and some of its content may be better reflected in the analysis section, also reducing some repetition.
- The report would be strengthened by a short Conclusions section to sum up the review's key findings, as recommended by the Statutory Guidance.

Once completed the Home Office would be grateful if you could provide us with a digital copy of the revised final version of the report with all finalised attachments and appendices and the weblink to the site where the report will be published. Please ensure this letter is published alongside the report.

Please send the digital copy and weblink to DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gov.uk. This is for our own records for future analysis to go towards highlighting best practice and to inform public policy.

The DHR report including the executive summary and action plan should be converted to a PDF document and be smaller than 20 MB in size; this final Home Office QA Panel feedback letter should be attached to the end of the report as an annex; and the DHR Action Plan should be added to the report as an annex. This should include all implementation updates and note that the action plan is a live document and subject to change as outcomes are delivered.

Please also send a digital copy to the Domestic Abuse Commissioner at DHR@domesticabusecommissioner.independent.gov.uk

On behalf of the QA Panel, I would like to thank you, the report chair and author, and other colleagues for the considerable work that you have put into this review.

Yours sincerely,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel