

Mr Peter Moyes
Nottingham Crime and Drugs Partnership Board.
The Shire Hall
Nottingham
NG1 1HN

30 July 2014

Dear Mr Moyes,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report from Nottingham (Operation Hornpipe) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel.

The QA Panel would like to thank you for conducting this review and for providing them with the Executive Summary, Overview Report, and Action Plan. In terms of the assessment of reports the QA Panel judges them as either adequate or inadequate. It is clear that a lot of effort has gone into producing this report, and I am pleased to tell you that it has been judged as adequate by the QA Panel.

The QA Panel noted the Alzheimer's society were members of the DHR Panel, and thought the decision to involve them was appropriate and commendable. The QA Panel also welcomed your reference to the Draft Care and Support Bill (2012) and the whole family approach to carer's assessments that it contained. These elements enriched the analysis of this tragedy.

There were some issues that the QA Panel felt would benefit from further consideration and clarification before you publish the final report:

- Please review the Executive Summary and include further text to ensure all the recommendations in the Overview Report are also captured in the Executive Summary;
- Consider using consistent coding for the family members in Executive Summary and Overview report;
- Please review the Chronology to ensure it is appropriately anonymised in accordance with the Statutory Guidance, prior to publication; and,

- Please strengthen the Action Plan with the addition of target dates on more of the actions and timescales or milestones for implementation.

The QA Panel also noted that the Chair of the DHR was the Director of the Crime and Drug Partnership for the area. The QA Panel would like to highlight that the Statutory Guidance requires the Chair to be independent. The QA Panel felt that it appeared as though the Chair would have been directly associated with some of the agencies involved in this review, e.g. the police. Although police had no real role in this case, they were part of the review, which suggests a conflict.

The report also states that the report writer was an independent consultant. But an open source search revealed that she was an internal auditor in Nottingham Council during part of the time period in which the review was conducted.

You may wish to consider these points on independence when establishing future DHR reviews. It may also be helpful to the reader if further text were added to this report to clarify independence further, prior to publication.

We do not need to see another version of the report, but I would ask you to include this letter as an appendix to the report when the report is published.

Yours sincerely,

Christian Papaleontiou, Acting Chair of the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel
Head of the Interpersonal Violence Team, Safeguarding & Vulnerable Peoples Unit