

Cllr Michael Hill OBE
Kent County Council
Sessions House
County Hall
Maidstone
ME14 1XQ

11th August 2021

Dear Cllr Hill,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Tamana) for Kent 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 23rd June 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 felt the DHR is sensitive and thought provoking. The panel has clearly committed effort and energy into the review despite the limited information available. The victim's voice comes through in the report, particularly through the use of her university application extract at the start of the report, allowing the report to begin with her voice and keep it central throughout.

The panel also worked to gain a more personal insight into the victim's experience by seeking contributions from her network, including her employer, the imam from her local mosque and involving in the panel two members with some of the same lived experience and knowledge of the community from which the victim came, in order to produce a culturally sensitive review, which is commended. The Equality and Diversity section is comprehensive and considers all relevant factors, extending beyond the nine required to be more holistic to the victim's experience.

The review makes clear distinctions between religion and cultural beliefs and uses culturally appropriate pseudonyms. It also identifies the lack of agency contact and professional knowledge and highlights a number of important issues in relation to 'honour'-based abuse (HBA) and cultural conflicts that can face migrants from different countries with differing social norms and traditions.

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 report does not make reference to the scoping process, this should be explained.
- Family Involvement:
 - 6.1 states family did not engage with review, but it previously said the chair was able to speak to male family members.
 - It would be beneficial to expand on the attempts that were made to engage the family with the review (what attempts were made and how) and where they did contribute, what form this took.
 - Arrangements could have been explored ahead of the initial meeting with the family so that a female member of the panel could have attended and held a parallel meeting to that with the male of the family.
 - The report references evidence and information to the panel on Tamana being subject to DA but does not provide detail.
 - Were the family in need of translated documents / interpreters and were these provided / considered – if not this could have possibly impacted on the family's ability to engage with the DHR.
- Key lines of enquiry should be in main body of report and clearly answered within report. For example, one of the key lines of enquiry makes reference multiple times to an eye injury when Shama arrived to the UK, but this is not discussed in the report.
- An approach to Shama's employer could have been considered. Especially as he was working as a taxi driver which has safeguarding implications as he could be in contact and alone with vulnerable people.
- The action plan has no identifiable outcomes and consists largely of increasing knowledge and understanding of HBV, adding resources to websites and training. Recommendation 4 suggests that Kent Police review of its 'honour'-based abuse policy is being reviewed and rewritten, but there is no timeline against this. A multi-agency approach to reviewing all strategies and policies relating to 'honour'-based abuse would be useful, together with clear outcomes that would make a positive difference.

- The Equality and Diversity section does not seem to consider Shama's, this needs to be added. It is also noted that the factors, whilst mentioned are not explicitly named (Sex, Religion, Age, Race, Marriage, & outside the nine, immigration, language).
- It is not clear if information was sought from the UK Border Force in relation to entry to the UK for both parties. It would be useful to have a recommendation for the UK Border Force.

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