



Home Office

Interpersonal Abuse Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Tel: 020 7035 4848
www.homeoffice.gov.uk

Leah Morgan
Safeguarding Business Coordinator
Cwm Taf Morgannwg Safeguarding Board
Unit 1 Maritime Industrial Estate
Pontypridd
CF37 1NY

26 January 2020

Dear Leah Morgan,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Adult Practice Review report (Rose) for Cwm Taf 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 18th November therefore the report was assessed by a virtual process. For the virtual Panel, members provided their comments by email, the Home Office secretariat summarised the feedback and the Panel agreed the feedback.

The QA Panel commented that this was a well written report which has made a genuine effort to probe and identify lessons which will change practice, particularly within Mental Health Services. The Panel felt that Rose's voice comes through and there is a clear sense of the difficulties she faced. The 7-minute briefing is a useful summary and the learning themes are important, as is the good practice identified; a learning event is a constructive way of bringing all those involved together to share reflections and learning. There were good attempts to engage with the victim's family and perpetrator although the Panel are unsure whether the family realised that they could have accessed specialist advocacy support.

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 for final development:

- The Panel felt the review did not answer the terms of reference fully and there appeared to be no external expert DA representative on the panel.
- The panel members names are not stated, only the agency's name. For transparency, the representative's names should be included.
- The Panel felt that having a chair who may still be part of an agency involved is not acceptable; though they may strive to be objective and independent, the perception, particularly to families and the public will be that they cannot be truly independent.

A Chair should not be connected with the agencies and the area in which the DHR is taking place.

- The family contributions have provided valuable insights into the victim's life and paint a vivid portrait of her as a person. Further background on the perpetrator would have been helpful which could have included information from his psychiatric assessment for the court proceedings.
- The Panel would have liked to see more analysis on the barriers Rose faced in accessing help, and what agencies could do in the future, particularly around raising awareness of intra familial/intergenerational abuse.
- The Panel felt that the action plan is below the standard expected and centres on inputs rather than outcomes. Within the action plan it notes responses received but does not say what the response was.
- The Panel had some concerns on two key issues around family involvement. Firstly, did the family understand the different roles of the FLO and a specialist and expert advocate – was this explained to them? Secondly, the Methodology Report states that the family continue to have unanswered questions. The family should have the opportunity to seek answers and the Panel hope there is a system in place for this to happen.
- The report itself is very clinical. To keep the victim at the centre, putting a pen portrait, and giving condolences at the start, would set the tone.
- Paragraph numbering would assist in referencing the report contents and pseudonyms for all parties would be useful, not just the victim.
- The Panel felt that the timeline should at least cover the MARAC (May as opposed to June). This is a multiagency meeting and thus worth analysing fully.
- The Panel felt that the lack of a chronology detailing agency contact makes it difficult to understand the timings of agency interactions and the coordination which took place.
- The actual date of death of the fatal attack is given, this should be removed to just the month and year.
- The 7-minute briefing document has the title Domestic Homicide Adult Practice Review 'initials. This may be the victim's real initials and should be removed and replaced with her pseudonym.

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.

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