

Interpersonal Abuse Unit 2 Marsham Street London SW1P 4DF Tel: 020 7035 4848 www.homeoffice.gov.uk

Katie Walker Community Safety Manager Runnymede Borough Council Station Road Addlestone KT15 2AH

28th May 2025

Dear Katie,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Monro) for Runnymede Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was considered at the QA Panel meeting on 30th April 2025. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

The QA Panel felt that the review was well written and sensitive, with clear language and nuanced, trauma-informed analysis. The QA Panel noted the excellent use of background research throughout, particularly relating to the issues of alcohol, suicide and domestic abuse in Lithuania and the impact this may have had on Monro.

The QA Panel noted the clear involvement from Monro's family. They acknowledged that culturally sensitive pseudonyms were used and that the report was translated into Russian for the family to read and comment on, which was good practice. The report also provided a good sense of who Monro was and the adversities she experienced during her life, particularly during the marriage break up, the domestic and financial abuse she experienced and the impact of deteriorating mental health.

The QA Panel felt it was positive that the review was a jointly commissioned DHR and Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) as the criteria for both were met. The action plan is SMART and it was positive to see that specialist services, including one representing Lithuanian victim-survivors, were included on the panel.

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.

The CSP may wish to consider only publishing the action plan and a brief learning summary due to the possible impact on the children. This is for the CSP to decide.

Areas for final development:

- Condolences are offered to Monro's family, however not until page six of the
 overview report under the family involvement section. It may be better if these
 were placed at the commencement of the report. Additionally, the QA Panel
 noted that there was no pen portrait from the family; it would be helpful to
 confirm whether the family were asked to provide one.
- There are some issues with consistency and anonymity that should be addressed. The month of death is missing from the cover page, and the year of death is given as 2022 whereas it stated as 2021 in the report. The same applies to Executive Summary. The initial paragraph identifies Monro's age, then later in the report she is described as being in her early thirties. 1.1 includes the exact date of death and this is repeated elsewhere (as well as in the Executive Summary). 13.4 and 13.7 also reveal the sex of the children and there are gendered pronouns elsewhere (e.g. 14.3).
- The Equality and Diversity section states that economic abuse was not a factor in this case, but 15.6.15 discusses 'financial control up until the time she became financially independent' suggesting that economic abuse is relevant. Economic abuse is also referred to at 15.10.2 in Monro's contact with a domestic abuse service. This should therefore be explored or clarified. The QA panel also questioned whether there was any learning for the family court around financial abuse/control that could be included.
- In section 12, the QA Panel felt that further exploration of how barriers around cultural identity and English not being Monro's first language applied to the situation might be helpful, and that any learning identified from this should be highlighted.
- In reference to 15.4.9, the QA Panel asked whether alternative routes to support were offered and whether additional learning could be provided to staff with more information regarding how to signpost or refer to other suitable services or organisations.
- There is repetition of the recommendations in section 18, and a number of the recommendations on pages 60-61 are missing the lead agency.
- The Action Plan should be populated or updated as the deadlines have now passed.
- The Domestic Abuse Commissioner should be included in the dissemination list.
- The report requires a thorough proofread. The different colour fonts and edits at 15.7 also make it somewhat hard to understand what is and isn't intended to be published.

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