



Home Office

Public Protection Unit  
2 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DF

T: 020 7035 4848  
[www.gov.uk/homeoffice](http://www.gov.uk/homeoffice)

Aarron Locks  
Community Safety Manager  
Fenland District Council

25 June 2018

Dear Mr Locks,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report for Fenland ('Irena') to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 25 April 2018. I apologise for the delay in providing the Panel's feedback.

The QA Panel would like to thank you for conducting this review and for providing them with the final report. The Panel concluded that this review identifies useful learning and contributions from the victim's mother and other sources help to see events through the victim's eyes. The Panel particularly liked the information in the review about the home country and the culture of the victim and perpetrator. The Panel also commended the breadth and expertise of the review panel.

There were, however, some aspects of the report which the Panel felt may benefit from further analysis, or be revised, which you will wish to consider:

- Whilst the review identifies coercive and controlling behaviour, the Panel felt examples of this conduct by the perpetrator could have been more clearly evidenced within the report, for example by bringing them together under a particular heading;
- Risk is mentioned but not considered in sufficient depth;
- The Panel noted the review recognises that non-English speakers may be prevented from coming forward to seek advice and support, but felt that it did not adequately highlight that lack of English not only forms a language barrier but also adds to isolation factors and is a significant barrier to being able to seek help;

- Linked to the above, in the discussion around isolation factors, the review does not clearly draw out specific sources of isolation such as the lack of money to telephone home and her reliance on alcohol exacerbating her isolation;
- It would be helpful if the methodology section could be expanded to describe what sources of information were used and how these were obtained, for example through witness statements or face to face interviews;
- There is no “Parallel Reviews” section as suggested in the statutory guidance. Information on sentencing and the coroner’s inquest, which is currently situated within the equality and diversity section, would be more appropriate under a parallel reviews section;
- It would be helpful if the report could confirm that the names used in the review are pseudonyms and whether or not they were chosen by the family. Please also note that anonymity may be compromised by the inclusion of the specific court date;
- For transparency, you may wish to briefly explain the background and independence of the ‘assistant to the chair’ to confirm there are no potential conflicts of interest;
- The executive summary is missing key sections, such as contributors to the review, list of review panel members, terms of reference, summary chronology and a conclusions section. An executive summary should contain sufficient information to enable it to be read in isolation;
- Please proof read the reports as there are a number of typing errors.

The Panel does not need to review another version of the report, but I would be grateful if you could include our letter as an appendix to the report. I would be grateful if you could email us at [DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:DHREnquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk) and provide us with the URL to the report when it is published.

The QA Panel felt it would be helpful to routinely sight Police and Crime Commissioners on DHRs in their local area. I am, accordingly, copying this letter to the PCC for information.

Yours sincerely

**Charlotte Hickman**

Acting Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel