



Stavroula Sidiropoulou
Domestic Homicide Review Officer
stavroulasidiropoulou@warwickshire.gov.uk

29 September 2020

Dear Stavroula Sidiropoulou,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (DHR W 03) for South Warwickshire Community Safety Partnership to the Home Office. Due to the COVID-19 situation the Quality Assurance (QA) Panel was unable to meet as scheduled on 19 August therefore the report was assessed by a virtual panel process. For the virtual panel, Panel members provided their comments by email, the Home Office secretariat summarised the feedback and the Panel agree the feedback.

The QA Panel found this to be a clear, thorough, sensitive report which conveys compassion and respect. The Panel felt that the tribute right at the very front of the review sets the tone. It puts Trish right at the very heart of the review and movingly illustrates the devastating impact of domestic homicide on family members. It is a brave and powerful testimony and we would like to thank the Chair and Panel for giving both Trish and her son a voice. The report makes good use of research in the analysis, including research around economic abuse, and reference is made to a previous DHR at 8.21. It shows a good understanding of domestic abuse and coercive control and is overall sensitive. It's good to see economic abuse recognised here and its impact of it upon Trish. It is clear to see that the Chair has clearly gone to great lengths to engage with friends and family members and this really enhances the review in terms of information but also in ensuring that Trish is at the heart of the review.

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

Areas of final development include:

- The Panel felt that the action plan is focussed on process, with completed actions lacking any outcomes. There seems to be no system-wide learning planned/having been taken and this is possibly a gap, given how complex, classic and richly-informative a case study this is.
- To improve anonymity the exact date of death needs to be removed and the sex of the children, including use within the genogram

- There is no Equality & Diversion section in the main body of the report. There is consideration given in Appendix 1 under 'Individual Needs' but the E&D section should be included in the main body of the report. It would be beneficial to include how women are disproportionately impacted by DA and Domestic Homicide
- The DHR Chair appears to be using a generic DHR template which does not always appear to have been tailored to this specific case. E.g. para 1.2.5 refers to DHRs in cases of suicide – however this case is a murder not a suicide so this section should be deleted.
- Section 6 on the airline industry does not sit naturally, as set out. Also, as there is no recommendation made, the Panel would like further clarity on this. There seems to be an important point to make and it may be better that a recommendation for the specific airline, together with a more general one for the industry, would be relevant.
- The Panel felt that it would have been particularly relevant to have a DA service, SEA/economic abuse and/or stalking specialists on the panel – and this may be helpful for future reviews to consider.
- Barriers to access services – the victim and perpetrator lived in a rural village, the panel could have considered how this may have impacted on the victim seeking support and how accessible services were for her.
- Some of the victim's friends knew that she was in an abusive relationship, it would have been useful to consider what barriers they may have experienced to support the victim to seek support
- There is a lot of Home Office Guidance quoted throughout which takes away from the flow and real content of the review.
- Researchers/Academics names are mis-spelled and MUST be corrected before publication. E.g. Jane Monkton Smith should be Jane **Monckton** Smith (7.3, Footnotes 23 and 30, bibliography), Nicola Sharp-Jeff's should be Nicola Sharp **Jeffer** (7.21, 7.22, Footnote 31, bibliography) and Neil Webster should be **Neil Websdale** (4.23, footnote 32 and bibliography)
- Recommendation 6 would benefit from being lined into the wider work being carried out by Employers Initiative on Domestic Abuse (EIDA)
- There are many typos within the report which need correcting. A thorough proof read is recommended. TYPOs: 1.1.2, 1.3.2, 4.79, 7.31, 7.50, 5.30, 6.7, 7.56, 7.57,

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 also ensure that 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.

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

Linda Robinson

Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel