

Sophie Jarrett
County Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence
Strategic Coordinator
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Prism House
Davy Way
Waterwells Business Park
Gloucester
GL2 2AD

15th February 2024

Dear Sophie,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Daisy) for Gloucester City Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 21st December 2023. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

The QA Panel felt this was a comprehensive and compassionate report. They noted the tribute to Daisy in the beginning which they thought was very touching. They also positively commented on the involvement of Daisy's family in the report. In addition to engagement with the family, this report included good practice around interviewing the landlord to provide useful context and involving the care home manager of the privately owned premises which gave an insight into Daisy's lived experience, making the report very thorough.

Furthermore, there is good representation from different organisations and a strong Equality and Diversity section which examined the intersectionality of sex, suicide, race, and disability. The QA panel also noted there is a diverse range of relevant panel members, including experts around substance misuse, mental health, suicide, and domestic abuse. The report effectively highlighted the gaps in support provided to the victim, such as several instances of a lack of referrals to specialist domestic abuse services. It is positive to see a reference to local DHRS and the recommendation that a thematic analysis of local suicide DHRs be conducted (1.15.2).

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:

- There were a few places that the QA Panel felt the language should have been more sensitive. For example:
 - 3.2.106 states that AOT discussed with Daisy ‘financial management and how she would lend Petar her bank card’ – this may be the language used by the IMR but it could be recognised that, if she was being abused, Daisy was not freely ‘lending’ her bank card to the perpetrator.
- The first two recommendations in the action plan, which are national, could include actions for the CSP of notifying the relevant agencies (i.e. the Home Office and Department of Health and Social Care).
- Recommendation 6 states that ‘...to ensure appropriate training on economic abuse is available’, but the key milestones only refer to wider domestic abuse training, so it is unclear if more specific economic abuse training is being explored.
- There needs to be more explanation at 1.2.10 as to why a joint DHR/SAR was not commissioned.
- The date of Daisy’s death is apparent in the Terms of Reference included as an appendix, at paragraph 1.
- It could be useful to include a rationale on why the panel decided not to contact the victim’s previous partners.
- It would have been better to see more consideration of the partner’s ethnicity (Bulgarian) and how this may have impacted his knowledge in accessing services. English was not his first language so some exploration on how this may have impacted on decision making or responses to services.
- There is a need for independence and expertise in managing domestic abuse in safeguarding investigations. The safeguarding enquiry was allocated to the person who had secured accommodation to Daisy with her partner. They had allowed that partner to be present throughout most medical consultations and clinical reviews.
- Economic abuse should be treated in the same way as any other form of abuse linked to domestic abuse, as opposed to treating it as a property crime. This is an area where the referral to/or advice of specialist domestic abuse service is essential.
- Though the review shows a strong understanding of economic abuse, Daisy’s weight loss recorded by agencies was another potential sign of economic abuse. Similarly, the burglary she reported in November 2019, Petar told police that the money she reported missing ‘will likely be hidden by her

somewhere' – was it considered that this might be her only way of hiding money to prevent Petar taking it, like he had with her bank card?

- The copyright of the report was questioned as it shows as Standing Together and not the CSP.
- There were some typos in the report. One being in 1.14.3 with the repeat of 'the Safer Gloucestershire'. There were more typos in paragraphs 3.2.128 and 4.2.30.

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.

The DHR report including the executive summary and action plan should be converted to a PDF document and be smaller than 20 MB in size; this final Home Office QA Panel feedback letter should be attached to the end of the report as an annex; and the DHR Action Plan should be added to the report as an annex. This should include all implementation updates and note that the action plan is a live document and subject to change as outcomes are delivered.

Please also send a digital copy to the Domestic Abuse Commissioner at DHR@domesticabusecommissioner.independent.gov.uk

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,

Home Office DHR Quality Assurance Panel