

## Appendix to the Home Office's feedback letter

### Responses of the Chair/Author and the Domestic Homicide Review Panel to the 'Areas for Development' identified by the Home Office

	Area for development	Response and rationale*
1	There is no information on who chose the pseudonyms for John and the other members of the family.	Paragraph 3.5 has been amended accordingly: "To protect the identity of individuals and with the agreement of family members, the following anonymised terms and pseudonyms have been used throughout this Review".
2	To improve anonymity, the exact date of death should be amended to show only the month and year.	Paragraphs 1.2 and 14.2.38 have been amended accordingly.
3	It would be useful to have an explanation of who STAR is at 14.1.21.	Paragraph 14.1.21 has amended to provide this explanation.
4	Panel membership – it may have been beneficial to have a debt advice specialist service on the panel such as Citizens Advice Bureau. It would also have benefitted from having an organisation such as AgeUK on the panel to look at economic vulnerabilities and support. If these organisations were contacted but unable to participate, this should be stated.	<p>This comment has been noted by the Chair/Author.</p> <p>Citizen's Advice and the city council's own debt support agencies were approached prior to the review, but none had any trace of the family. This is now reflected in paragraph 5.2.2.</p>
5	The report states that "there were no clear indicators of domestic abuse" however there are many elements that read as economic abuse and these significantly get overlooked or are not recognised at any point in the DHR. For example, reference to findings about John's access to funds at short notice and how this links to DA may be a good reference point for this case.	<p>The chair is disappointed in this factually inaccurate statement from the Home Office Panel. The panel carefully considered the facts, seeking to triangulate information, as opposed to leaping to a conclusion as to the circumstances.</p> <p>Paragraph 16.3.8 highlights the financial difficulties experienced by the couple and specifically explores and recognises financial control as being symptomatic of domestic abuse. It further states that without further triangulation, it is not possible to conclude that this was abuse within the household.</p>

\*paragraph numbers refer to the Overview report

## Appendix to the Home Office's feedback letter

		Under 'Conclusion and lessons learned', paragraph 17.2.3 clearly references economic abuse. There are also two footnote references, numbers 37 and 38 within this section.
6	The action plan falls short and is not sufficiently outcome focused. The action plan should go beyond not missing opportunities and be more proactive in ensuring the wellbeing of people in situations similar to John. The neglect that John experienced is so evident that it is hard to understand why the panel has not focussed on this in the action plan.	<p>There was representation at the panel by Safeguarding Adults.</p> <p>There was significant discussion and over several panel meetings, which took into account the evolution in professional practice and whether the same outcome would be likely now. This is subject to specific comment at paragraph 18.2.1 and is not acknowledged by the Home Office's Quality Assurance panel.</p> <p>The proactive steps taken by the two agencies included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GP practices have developed their approach to social prescribing significantly. This considers the patient's needs more holistically rather than concentrating purely on the presenting medical issue(s).</li> <li>• Housing's involvement was considered at length. The Panel concluded that housing staff were at risk of being desensitised to the signs of neglect, and hence a recommendation arose in that regard. It was noted that Housing is seeking accreditation by the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA). Also, there has been an evolution in the use of an electronic recording system that specifically cites/invites comments on the poor state of a house, safeguarding concerns.</li> </ul>
7	Although the equalities section does mention disability, sex and age, there was no reference to ethnicity or marriage. It would have been useful to mention these, even if it was decided they weren't relevant.	Paragraph 11.6 now addresses this comment.
8	A thorough proofread is needed to amend the many typos within the report.	This has been completed prior to publication.