



Mandi George  
Lead Officer, Safe Accommodation & Domestic Abuse  
Huntingdon Community Safety Partnership  
St Mary's  
Huntingdon  
PE29 3TN

19<sup>th</sup> December 2024

Dear Mandi,

Thank you for resubmitting the report (Louise) for Huntingdonshire Community Safety Partnership to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Panel. The report was reassessed in November 2024.

The QA Panel noted the positive engagement with Louise's mother and friends who contributed to the DHR process. They commented that the tributes to Louise throughout the report also help to provide a sense of her as a person. There are condolences provided to Louise's family, and it is understood the pseudonym used for the victim was chosen by Louise's mother and her children which was good practice.

The QA Panel noted that some of the issues raised in the previous feedback letter following the first submission have now been addressed. However, there are still some issues outstanding. On completion of these changes the DHR may be published.

### **Areas for development**

- The statutory guidance states that the executive summary title page should include the name the CSP, the victim's pseudonym, the month and year of death, the author's name and the date the report was completed. All of the information above (aside from the name of the CSP) appears to be redacted. This information is required by the statutory guidance and should be included. If, for any reason the Chair wanted her name redacted, a request should be made to the Home Office with the reasons stated.
- The children's names remain at 2.3 and 2.4 and should be removed.
- An explanation is also needed as to why panel member names are redacted in the executive summary.

- A reference to 'age difference' still remains which is unclear as at 1.53 the victim's partner is described as being of a 'similar age' at the time of her death. This requires further clarification.
- There is a weblink to the Lancet article (see 1.61), but no reflection or analysis, which could be included.
- The analysis in 3.22 and 3.23 is somewhat confusing. There is no mention of an assault but discussion of injuries. This requires clarification.
- The Panel felt that there could be further reflection relating to the lack of routine enquiry.
- The action plan is at appendix 5, however there is no confirmation that any of the actions have been completed. Please include updates where possible.

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](mailto: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](mailto: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