Home Office

Interpersonal Abuse Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Tel: 020 7035 4848
www.homeoffice.gov.uk

Karen Brown
Community Safety Team Leader/Safeguarding Co-ordinator
South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils
Abbey House, Abbey Close
Abingdon
OX14 3JE

21st April 2026

Dear Karen,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Ann) for South & Vale Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Board. The report was considered at the QA Board meeting on 26th February 2026. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

Please find the QA Board's feedback in the form below. On completion of the changes suggested the QA Board agrees with the CSP's request to publish the Executive Summary only.

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 and the feedback form 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 Board letter and feedback form 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 Board, 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 Board

DHR QA Board Feedback for the Community Safety Partnership

TITLE OF DHR	Ann
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP	South & Vale
DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD	26th February 2026
DECISION	QA Board agree to publish the Executive Summary only.
GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED	• The panel acknowledged that meaningful family involvement was essential to ensuring Ann's voice was heard in the review. • The panel explored adding Romanian cultural representation and a Doctor of Medicine with Romanian heritage was identified to review the draft. This was commended as good practice. • The identification of two key episodes (foreign conviction management and child protection intervention) adds clarity and strengthens the analysis. • The review is open in acknowledging gaps in services. • Several improvements (e.g. MOSOVO reminders) were implemented during the review. Making proactive changes is good practice and this was commended by the QA Board.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs	Future reviews would benefit from a clearly defined pen portrait and formal expression of condolences at the outset.

	DHR SECTION	**DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)**
1	Title Page	No amendments required.
2	Contents Page	Please consider including sections on pen portrait, parallel reviews and lessons learnt.
3	Pen Portrait	The report does not appear to include a clearly defined standalone pen portrait section. Whilst background information is provided, it would strengthen the report to include a dedicated victim-centred pen portrait that meaningfully reflects Ann's life, identity, relationships and the voice of her family.
4	Condolences	No amendments required.

5	Confidentiality and Anonymity	No amendments required.
6	Terms of Reference	No amendments required.
7	Equality and Diversity	The attempt to consult Romanian community perspectives reflects commendable effort toward cultural sensitivity. However, equality considerations remain largely descriptive. For example, while Romanian heritage is noted, there is limited exploration of whether immigration status, cultural norms, masculinity constructs, or systemic barriers influenced risk recognition or agency responses. Please review this accordingly.
8	Background Information	No amendments required.
9	Combined Chronology	No amendments required.
10	Overview	The overview could be strengthened by explicitly stating that the absence of later agency contact does not equate to absence of risk, and by setting out what “should have changed” because of earlier interventions.
11	Analysis	No amendments required.
12	Conclusions	• The current conclusion feels disproportionately short compared to the depth of the analysis and risks underplaying the significance of the learning identified. Expanding it to summarise core findings would be helpful. • Given the views of the family, the assertion that no agency or individual could have prevented the homicide risks being interpreted as the system absolving itself of responsibility. The brevity of the conclusion may further compound this. Please therefore consider restating the key learning themes or explicitly acknowledging the complexities that were present in this section to demonstrate accountability and commitment to meaningful change.
13	Lessons learnt and recommendations	• While learning points are identified throughout the analysis, the report would benefit from a consolidated “Lessons Learned” section to clearly highlight the key systemic themes emerging from the review. • The recommendations would benefit from stronger, outcome-focused wording with clear timescales. • Given the identified shortcomings in Child Protection planning, greater assurance is needed regarding how domestic abuse expertise will be embedded in this area.
14	Timescales	No amendments required.

15	Involvement of family / friends / community	No amendments required.
16	DHR contributors	No amendments required
17	DHR Panel	No amendments required
18	DHR Author	No amendments required
19	Parallel Reviews	No amendments required
20	Dissemination	Please include the family, local Police Crime Commissioner and the Domestic Abuse Commissioner's Office.
21	Action Plan	• Where actions were completed prior to publication, this should be clearly referenced as learning implemented during the review period. • Additionally, while actions are largely specific and relevant, several lack clearly measurable outcomes. Strengthening the plan to include explicit review points would be beneficial.
22	Has there been a request to withhold publication? *If Yes, include the reason for the request. Is it proportionate and appropriate?*	Yes - there has been a request not to publish the report in full due to safeguarding issues and the impact on the victim's son. The QA Board concur with this request.
23	Any other comments	• Whilst the Executive Summary is structured and readable, it does not yet adequately reflect the depth of learning and identified practice weaknesses set out in the Overview Report. If this is to be the only published document, it must more explicitly acknowledge the shortcomings in statutory child protection intervention. If publication is limited to this document, it must more clearly articulate where practice fell short and what concrete changes have already been implemented. • Executive Summary 4.5: **'**Ann was very private about her relationship with Marius and shared little with her family. Outwardly she presented as "wearing the trousers" in the relationship.' Please use more appropriate language to demonstrate Ann's status in the relationship.

		• 14.10: ‘The family do challenge that how can a person with such serious offences be allowed into the country? And that Marius should never have been allowed into the UK.’ Please consider a restructure of these sentences for clarity. • The review requires a proofread to correct minor typos.