



Home Office

Public Protection Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

T: 020 7035 4848
www.gov.uk/homeoffice

Shafick Peerbux
Head of Community Safety
Public Protection Service
Kent County Council
First Floor Invicta House
Maidstone
ME14 1XX

22 January 2020

Dear Shafick

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Mary) for Kent CSP to the Home Office. The report was assessed by the Quality Assurance Panel (QA) on 20 November 2019.

The QA Panel noted that this is a well-written and clearly structured report, evidencing a good understanding of the dynamics of domestic abuse and producing some very relevant findings. The review has used sensitive language, taking account of the circumstances of the death. The Panel particularly commended how the report conveys compassion and respect and that the reader is enabled to see events through the victim's eyes. This is a comprehensive enquiry which has highlighted good practice and has drawn out some productive and focused recommendations.

The QA Panel felt that there are some aspects of the report which may benefit from revision but the Home Office is content that, on completion of these changes, the DHR may be published.

Areas of final development include:

- It would be helpful to clarify the role of the IOPC in paragraph 8.1. The IOPC reports performance which is below expected standards. It is not about discipline but identifying the need for change to the system a whole.
- Economic abuse features within the review and it would enhance the report to explore in more depth events such as: the speed of cohabitation; money taken from the victim's purse; the loss of weight as a possible indicator of food control; and limitations placed on the victim through a damaged vehicle.
- The report would benefit from an Equality & Diversity section which explores the protected characteristics as set out in the Equality Act 2010 and how the victim's social care needs may have impacted her ability to access help and support.
- It was highlighted that there was no IMR from probation. Due to this, the review would profit from probing the decision to allow the victim to house the perpetrator on

his release. In particular, the report should probe the missed opportunities to recall the offender and the issues highlighted when managing an offender between two areas. The report states that the victim was present with the perpetrator at his probation meetings, therefore it would add weight to the report to create recommendations for probation with regards to using these opportunities to assess the risk to partners.

- The language in the review referring to the police officer and the IDVA should be reviewed and consideration should be given to the caseload both professionals were managing. The report would benefit from a recommendation focused on defining safe working practices.
- The review draws attention to the good practice from housing with regards to their notifications to police. However, you may wish to consider the practical implications of recommendation seven (to place a DA flag on housing cases) as Area A Council will be completing a high volume of interviews.
- Another area of good practice featured in the review was the citing of previous DHRs with links to the MARAC process. However, you may want to revise paragraph 11.4.6 with regards to the risk factors needed for a MARAC referral. It states 14 are needed but the Panel advised that most practitioners take 10 as the indicator for a referral.
- It would benefit the report to add that MARAC cases should have a 12-month marker so if there is another incident in that period the case is sent back to MARAC. In addition, it would be conducive to stress that the IDVA should have made the referral of the case into MARAC rather than this be left for other agencies to complete.
- The report brings to light the issue that social media communication is not currently monitored in prison. It would be constructive to probe in more depth how this behaviour can lead to victims being groomed by perpetrators before their release.
- To further strengthen the recommendations, you may wish to detail the monitoring activity required to demonstrate that the necessary changes identified in the recommendations have been implemented.
- Considering the victim's experience within the report, it would be valuable to know what involvement the family had with regards to the review process as this is not clear.
- To assist the report's anonymity, it would be beneficial to remove the date of death from the report.

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 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 Home Office felt it would be helpful to routinely sight Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) on DHRs in their local area. Due to this, the Home Office will copy this letter to

your local PCC for information.

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

Hannah Buckley

Joint Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel