

Interpersonal Abuse Unit T: 020 7035 4848 2 Marsham Street London SW1P 4DF

www.gov.uk/homeoffice

Roselyn Baker Principal Policy Officer Policy and Partnerships Service Reform Directorate Salford CSP

18 February 2021

Dear Roselyn,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (RT) for Salford 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 9th December 2020 therefore the report was assessed by a virtual process. For the virtual panel, Panel members provided their comments by email, the Home Office secretariat summarised the feedback and the Panel agreed the feedback.

The QA Panel felt that this is a sensitively written report which highlights a number of missed opportunities. The family were consulted and their thoughts and insights are integrated throughout the report. The intersectionality of mental health, substance and domestic abuse is brought out in the report, as is the potential long term impact on children who witness abuse. The victim's voice comes through and there was good engagement from the victims family.

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:

- To improve anonymity please remove the date of death which appears in the report. •
- The action plan is focused on processes, and in small parts, output focused. It is not • outcomes focussed and, given the number of system failures identified, the Panel are unclear how members of the public would know if there had been any meaningful difference in outcomes for those at risk of abuse.
- Please clarify the number of individual management reviews (IMRs). There is a • disparity between what is stated in the main body of the report and the appendix.
- Reference is made to other reviews and the still awaited outcome of an Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) review – infomraiotn on how these



issues are going to be incorporated would be helpful.; It would also be helpful to understand what learning emerged from reviews that are relevant to this review, and if there is any indication that earlier learning has not been implemented.

- The format is slightly difficult to follow. It would be useful to have paragraph numberings and exact dates throughout the timeline.
- 5.1.3 seems to put a lot of onus on the victim recognising risk, and building resilience. In a coordinated community response the onus should be on agencies and communities to recognise and safeguard victims, as well as hold perpetrators to account.
- The Panel felt that sex should always be noted as a relevant protected characteristic due to the disproportional representation of female victims and male perpetrators.
- It would be helpful to add in target dates for the actions relating to Operation Encompass in the action plan.

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 along the report.

Please send the digital copy and weblink to <u>DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gov.uk</u>. 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

Lynne Abrams

Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel