



Home Office

Public Protection Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

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

Sian Jenkins
Partnership Officer
Bournemouth Borough Council
Room 106
Town Hall
Bourne Avenue
BH2 6DY

22 November 2018

Dear Sian,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report for Bournemouth (DHR B6) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 26 September. I am sorry 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 is a clear report which has carefully explored agency practices and has identified some useful lessons. However, the narrative is mainly through the lens of professionals and the absence of input from family and friends has resulted in a report in which the victim's voice is missing.

The Panel was also concerned at some of the language used in the report which could be perceived as victim-blaming. The following was highlighted as an example: "...*she was susceptible to becoming involved in abusive relationships*". The Panel felt that such statements should either be re-framed or be followed by counter-narrative, i.e. abusers prey on vulnerable persons.

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

- The report identifies opportunities where potentially the risks to the victim could have been mitigated. For example, the review found that professionals were unaware that there are refuges that admit people with complex needs. In light of this, the Panel felt you may wish to review the conclusion that, taking all the factors into account, it was impossible to keep the victim safe;
- Given the complex needs associated with this case, the Panel felt a specialist substance misuse representative on the review panel may have benefitted the review;

- More clarity on the independence of the chair would help to reassure readers that there are no conflicts of interest;
- The Panel felt it would be helpful if the report could confirm whether the letter inviting the family to participate in the review was followed-up and whether specialist advocacy support was offered to the family at any point;
- The executive summary excludes many of the findings identified in the overview report and the Panel suggested the two documents should be more closely aligned. For example, one report contains nine recommendations whereas the other contains ten;
- There is no information in the report explaining the delays given the terms of reference envisaged the review being completed in March 2017;
- Acronyms should be spelled out in full the first time they are used, e.g. “SNT”;
- The report will require a full proof read to correct typing and punctuation errors before publication.

The Panel noted the report states that the statutory guidance requires all DHR reports to be published but then confirms that only the executive summary will be published. The Panel would welcome clarification of the Partnership’s publication intentions.

Yours sincerely

Hannah Buckley
Chair of the Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel