



Domestic Homicide Review Overview Report

Name: Kiddo

Month and Year of Death: May 2023

Independent Chair: Carolyn Carson

Independent Author: Allison Sandiford

Final Draft – May 2025

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Timescales	3
3. Confidentiality	4
4. Terms of Reference	4
Methodology	4
Involvement of Family, Friends, Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community	5
Contributors to the Review	6
The Review Panel Members	6
Independent Chair and Author of the Overview Report	7
Parallel Reviews	8
Equality and Diversity	8
Dissemination	10
5. Background Information (The Facts)	11
6. Chronology	11
7. Overview	19
8. Analysis	19
9. Positive Practice	50
10. Conclusions	50
11. Lessons to be Learnt and Recommendations	52
Appendix 1 - The Independent Office for Police Conduct investigation Identifications	55
Appendix 2 - Agencies current training offers	55
Appendix 3 – Single Agency Recommendations	58

Kiddo was a man of quiet resilience and service. A former Army veteran of 12 years and a skilled engineer, he was a loner who was nonetheless friendly to all. Though he lived a solitary life in a ground-floor flat in Nottingham, he remained a devoted brother and uncle, valuing regular phone calls and football matches with his family. Having once been a registered counsellor, he possessed a degree of self-awareness and he openly acknowledged his struggles with grief and alcohol following the death of his ex-wife. He was a man who found purpose in helping others, a trait that unfortunately left him vulnerable to exploitation. At his core, Kiddo was a gentleman seeking connection in the isolating wake of a pandemic, whose inherent kindness was ultimately used against him.

1. Introduction

1.1. This report of a Domestic Homicide Review¹ examines agency responses and support given to Kiddo, a resident of Nottingham City, prior to the point of his death in May 2023.

1.2. In addition to agency involvement the review will also examine the past to identify any relevant background or trail of abuse before the homicide, whether support was accessed within the community and whether there were any barriers to accessing support. By taking a holistic approach the review seeks to identify appropriate solutions to make the future safer.

1.3. The circumstances that led to a review being undertaken in this case are that on a day in June 2023, police found Kiddo deceased in the cellar of his home. Police enquiries established a female who had been living with Kiddo (hereafter referred to as Barbara) as being responsible for his death.

1.4. The review will consider agencies contact/involvement with Kiddo and Barbara from October 2020 (when Barbara was released on licence from custody) until July 2023 (when professionals responded to Kiddo's murder). This time period was established by the panel members as it was deemed to offer sufficient analysis of Kiddo's and Barbara's history in order to understand learning for future practice. In addition, the report will include brief background information re any significant events and safeguarding issues prior to the scoping period if agencies consider that it would add value and learning to the review.

1.5. The key purpose for undertaking Domestic Homicide Reviews is to enable lessons to be learned from homicides where a person is killed as a result of domestic violence and abuse. In order for these lessons to be learned as widely and thoroughly as possible, professionals need to be able to understand fully what happened in each homicide, and most importantly, what needs to change in order to reduce the risk of such tragedies happening in the future.

1.6. It is not the purpose of this review to hold any individual or organisation to account. Other processes exist for that, including criminal proceedings, disciplinary procedures, employment law and systems of service and professional regulation.

2. Timescales

2.1. This review was agreed in August 2023 but did not commence until October 2024. It concluded in May 2025.

2.2. Reviews, including the overview report, should be completed, where possible, within six months. There was initial delay in relation to this review commencing caused by staffing capacity within Nottingham Community Safety Partnership in early 2024. In July 2024 a new Domestic Homicide Review Lead Officer was

¹ The purpose of the Domestic Homicide Review is to:

- a) establish what lessons are to be learned from the domestic homicide regarding the way in which local professionals and organisations work individually and together to safeguard victims.
- b) identify clearly what those lessons are both within and between agencies, how and within what timescales they will be acted on, and what is expected to change as a result.
- c) apply these lessons to service responses including changes to policies and procedures as appropriate; and
- d) prevent domestic violence and abuse homicide and improve service responses for all domestic violence and abuse victims and their children by developing a coordinated multi-agency approach to ensure that domestic abuse is identified and responded to effectively at the earliest opportunity.
- e) contribute to a better understanding of the nature of domestic violence and abuse; and
- f) highlight good practice.

recruited into post who has since taken full co-ordination of the review process and hereafter ensured consistency.

2.3. The review process took slightly longer than six months in order to accommodate facilitation and action planning with the relevant professionals.

3. Confidentiality

3.1. The findings of each review are confidential. Information is available only to participating officers/professionals and their line managers.

3.2. To protect the identity of the individuals involved, the subject of this review (who was 74 years old at the time of his murder), is referred to as Kiddo. The perpetrator, (who at the time of the murder was aged 44 years) is referred to as Barbara. Both individuals are White British.

4. Terms of Reference

Methodology

4.1. Following presentations and discussions, it was agreed on the 3rd of August 2023 by the members of the Domestic Homicide Review Screening group, that the case met the criteria for a Domestic Homicide Review. Carolyn Carson was secured as Independent Chair and Allison Sandiford, as Independent Author, in December 2023.

4.2. Whilst applying the principles of proportionality, learning from good practice, and engagement with families, the Independent Chair and Author have followed the Multi-Agency Statutory Guidance for the Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews, as amended in December 2016.

4.3. Following the Independent Chair and Author being in receipt of the agency screening reports, an initial scoping and first panel meeting was held on the 7th of October 2024, where agency representation, terms of reference, the scoping period and the project plan were agreed.

4.4. This was followed by the completion of further agency reports, and the panel met on three further dates to monitor the review process and contribute to the analysis and learning.

4.5. The panel² identified the following key lines of enquiry for the review:

- What was known about the circumstances of Kiddo's living arrangements and dynamics within this arrangement? Did agencies consider that Kiddo and Barbara lived in the household?
- What was known about the impact of their relationship on Kiddo's health and well-being? Were risks to Kiddo from that relationship identified where evident?
- What was known about Barbara's substance misuse. How did this impact on Kiddo?
- Were there opportunities to spot potential indicators of abuse and/or to identify risk of harm to Kiddo any stage?
- Were there opportunities to identify Barbara's offending background and previous risk assessments for violence that may have flagged concerns for Kiddo's welfare?
- Were there opportunities to support Kiddo to remove Barbara or support Barbara to live away from Kiddo?

² The key lines of enquiry were shared with Kiddo's sister and nephew. They did not suggest any amendments.

- How would Kiddo have perceived his situation? Would Kiddo have identified as being a victim of abuse?
- Were there opportunities to identify Kiddo as vulnerable and/or opportunities to reduce his vulnerability? Did Covid have an impact on Kiddo's vulnerability and support?
- Were support services available for Kiddo in his situation and if so, what barriers existed that prevented Kiddo accessing support?
- How well known are these services to the public or other potential victims in Kiddo's situation?
- What was professionals' approach to / recognition of abuse, in particular, where there is no known familial or intimate relationship?
- Were issues of slavery and exploitation considered by agencies through the lens of coercive and controlling behaviour? If so, were they identified as such?
- Did the fact that Kiddo was male contribute to agencies not identifying Kiddo as a victim?
- Did agencies consider that Kiddo may have been affected by trauma and consider how this may have affected his decision making in relation to Barbara?
- Did any barriers exist to prevent the reporting of abusive incidents in the home?
- Could communication and information sharing, within and between agencies have been improved during the scoping period?
- Did any opportunities exist for multi-agency referrals by professionals for vulnerability and/or risk management/ professionals' meetings?
- Did professionals have an opportunity to exercise professional curiosity? Were there any barriers to professionals having an opportunity to exercise professional curiosity, if so, what were they?
- Identify examples of positive practice, both single and multi-agency.

Involvement of Family, Friends, Colleagues, Neighbours and Wider Community

4.6. Nottingham Community Safety Partnership, the Independent Chair and the Independent Author would like to offer their condolences to the family and friends of Kiddo.

4.7. In the first instance Nottingham Community Safety Partnership liaised with the Family Liaison Officer who agreed to inform Kiddo's nephew of the review and invite him to contribute. A copy of the Home Office Domestic Homicide Review leaflet for family members was provided and the Family Liaison Officer also informed Kiddo's nephew of the support available through AAFDA³.

4.8. Thereafter Kiddo's nephew and Kiddo's sister met with the Independent Author and a representative of Nottingham Community Safety Partnership face-to-face. During the meeting the Independent Author further explained the Domestic Homicide Review process, shared the Key Lines of Enquiry, invited the family to meet the panel members, agreed pseudonyms and discussed Kiddo's circumstances and the support he had been offered.

4.9. Kiddo's family requested that the review did not seek to communicate with the perpetrator of Kiddo's murder. They explained that her demeanour in court had evidenced that she had no remorse and discussed how hard it would be for them if she were to be involved in this process. The Independent Author and panel members agreed that Barbara's voice could be heard through the agency reports of those who had worked with her.

³ Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse (AAFDA) has over a decade of experience advocating for families after the homicide, suicide or unexplained death of their family member or friend, following domestic abuse.

4.10. It was agreed that Kiddo's nephew would be the review's point of contact for the family and hereafter at regular intervals throughout the review process, there was ongoing communication with Kiddo's nephew by means of email and telephone.

4.11. Kiddo's nephew was able to view the report in private and comment.

Contributors to the Review

4.12. The following have contributed to the review by way of agency reports.

- Nottinghamshire Police
- Nottingham University Hospital
- Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust
- Nottingham City Housing Solutions
- Nottingham Recovery Network
- Prostitution Outreach Team
- Nottingham County Probation Service
- Nottingham City Community Safety Slavery and Exploitation Team
- NHS Nottingham Integrated Care Board
- Department for Work and Pension
- Adult Social Care
- Nottingham City Anti-Social Behaviour Team
- Community Protection Team
- Nottingham Women's Centre
- Juno Women's Aid
- Jericho Road Project
- Nottingham Fire Service
- Equation

4.13. All agency report authors have confirmed their independence with the exception of the Jericho Road Project. Only a small number of staff are employed by the Jericho Road Project, and all have worked directly with Barbara.

4.14. The following have contributed to this review by way of further communications.

- Kiddo's Housing Manager/Landlord

The Review Panel Members

4.15. Membership of the Domestic Homicide Review panel is;

Carolyn Carson	Independent Chair
Allison Sandiford	Independent Author
Rachel Street	Community Safety Partnership
Jemma Whitworth	Slavery and Exploitation Team
Jo Elbourne	Nottinghamshire Police
Helen Pritchett	Nottingham Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust
Debbie Richards	Housing Solutions

Nick Judge	Integrated Care Board
Katy Pearson	Department for Work and Pensions
Jane Paling	Slavery and Exploitation Team
Maggie Westbury	Nottingham University Hospitals Foundation Trust
Karen Turton	City Care Partnership
Fiona McVey	Nottinghamshire Police
Ishbel Macleod	Integrated Care Board
Rachel Daley	Equation
Kerry Jackson	Department for Work and Pensions
Laura Shelton	Nottingham County Probation Services
Martin Illingworth	Age Concern
Julie Stevens	Adult Social Care
Debbie Dyson	Nottingham Recovery Network
Julie Hitchen	Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust

4.16. The panel met on four occasions. Two occasions included discussions with key frontline practitioners from the agencies⁴ involved, and the agency report authors:

- 7th of October 2024
- 14th of January 2025
- 11th of March 2025
- 6th of May 2025

4.17. All panel members have confirmed their independence with the exception of the Jericho Road Project who has been directly involved with Barbara. As mentioned, only a small number of staff are employed by the Jericho Road Project, and all have worked directly with Barbara.

Independent Chair and Author of the Overview Report

4.18. The review commissioned Carolyn Carson, an independent safeguarding reviewer, to act as Independent Chair. Carolyn is a retired Police Superintendent who specialised in Safeguarding, retiring whilst holding the post of Safeguarding Lead at Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, in 2011. In 2014 Carolyn completed the SILP Lead Reviewer Course⁵ and post-retirement Carolyn has conducted a number of adult safeguarding reviews, and Domestic Homicide Reviews both independently and with SILP.

4.19. The report has been authored by Allison Sandiford. Allison gained experience in domestic abuse and safeguarding both adults and children whilst working for a police service. Allison was part of a team responsible for the force's contribution to delivering Early Help, preventive support and problem-solving interventions for adults and children, in partnership with other key local and regional agencies. She

⁴ Housing Solutions, Integrated Care Board, Slavery and Exploitation Team, POW, Nottingham Recovery Network, Equation, Jericho Road Project, Nottingham Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, Nottingham Police, Probation Services, Department for Work and Pensions, Adult Social Care, and Nottingham Community Safety Partnership.

⁵ SILP is an approach to reviewing cases in the context of Child Safeguarding Practice Reviews, Safeguarding Adult Reviews, Domestic Homicide Reviews and any other form of learning activity.

represented the force at strategy meetings and protection conferences to assess risk and negotiate actions with other agencies to instate interventions to safeguard individuals' lives. She also gained experience in chairing meetings, conferences, and partnership initiatives such as daily management risk meetings and Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences.

4.20. Allison left the police force in 2019 and after also completing the SILP Lead Reviewer Course, began to conduct serious case reviews in both children's and adults safeguarding, and Domestic Homicide Reviews.

4.21. Both Allison and Carolyn have completed the Home Office online learning with regard to conducting Domestic Homicide Reviews and have recently completed the AAFDA⁶ Domestic Homicide Review training (in 2024). Both have a positive attitude to continuing professional development and regularly attend training and seminars.

4.22. Neither Allison nor Carolyn have any links to Nottingham City Council or any of its partner agencies.

Parallel Reviews

4.23. In December 2023, following a criminal investigation, Barbara was sentenced to life imprisonment with a minimum of 25 years.

4.24. At the time of writing this report, HM Coroner had not set a date for inquest. The Coroner was made aware of this Domestic Homicide Review in October 2023.

4.25. The Independent Office for Police Conduct investigated Nottinghamshire Police's handling of safeguarding concerns relating to Kiddo prior to his murder. The learning identified during the investigation can be found at [Appendix 1](#).

Equality and Diversity

4.26. The Independent Author has considered the nine protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 (age, disability; gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation).

4.27. Kiddo was a 74 year old White British male, and Barbara is a White British female.

4.28. Kiddo was married but he had separated from his wife (who has since passed away) prior to the scoping period of this review. He has no known genetically related children but had a stepson from his marriage. His stepson also passed away prior to the scoping period of this review.

4.29. It is not known if Barbara had ever been married but she has two (now adult) children from whom she is reportedly estranged.

4.30. There are no reports of abuse or criminal acts recorded between Barbara and Kiddo prior to the scoping period of this review. But even had there been, because Kiddo and Barbara were not known to be intimate partners or related, any incidents would not have been recorded as domestic abuse.

⁶ Advocacy After Fatal Domestic Abuse (AAFDA) are a Centre of Excellence for Reviews after Fatal Domestic Abuse and for Expert and Specialist Advocacy and Peer Support.

4.31. However it is relevant to this review that prior to the scoping period, Barbara had accumulated a number of convictions, and these included domestic abuse offences committed against her grandfather dating back to 2010.

4.32. Barbara was convicted of assaulting her grandfather and on two occasions received custodial sentences⁷. These incidents stemmed from Barbara demanding money from her grandfather to pay for her drug habit.

4.33. Whilst Barbara’s murder of Kiddo is not a domestic offence under the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 – which describes domestic abuse as the:

- Behaviour of a person (“A”) towards another person (“B”) if—
 - (a) A and B are each aged 16 or over and are personally connected⁸ to each other, and
 - (b) the behaviour is abusive,

section 9(1) of the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004⁹, directs that the murder be reviewed by means of a Domestic Homicide Review on the grounds that Barbara had been living with Kiddo at his property at the time - and Barbara and Kiddo were therefore, members of the same household.

4.34. Although the abuse did not meet the definition of 'domestic abuse' under the act, a domestic abuse specialist from Equation still provided assistance to the review panel. This support helped the panel to gain a better understanding of issues related to men experiencing abuse and the available resources for support.

4.35. Neither Kiddo nor Barbara have a recorded disability.

4.36. Kiddo self-reported excessive consumption of alcohol. This is relevant because whilst alcohol use by either a victim or a perpetrator is never a cause of abuse, it is known that alcohol can leave an individual more vulnerable, (especially if it affects an individual’s ability to access support).

4.37. Barbara reported living with depression and was known to use substances. Whilst substance use may have escalated Barbara’s propensity to be violent; it is, like alcohol, never a cause of abuse. However, it is recognised that Barbara’s substance use is relevant to her abusive behaviour in the sense that she was controlling and coercing Kiddo and financially abusing him in order to feed her drug habit.

4.38. Barbara further paid for her drugs through activity described in records as ‘sex work’ and there are numerous police reports of Barbara working as a ‘street sex worker’ in the red-light district of Nottingham.

4.39. It is more accurate to describe this activity as survival sex (and this is how it will be referred to hereafter within this report). Survival sex is a form of prostitution that individuals engage in because of their extreme need. It describes the practice of people trading sex for basic necessities, for example food, a place to sleep,

⁷ A Protection from Harassment Order was imposed in 2019 with an unlimited end date which had conditions not to contact her grandfather or visit the area of his home address.

⁸ For the purposes of this Act, two people are “personally connected” to each other if any of the following applies—

- (a) they are, or have been, married to each other.
- (b) they are, or have been, civil partners of each other.
- (c) they have agreed to marry one another (whether or not the agreement has been terminated);
- (d) they have entered into a civil partnership agreement (whether or not the agreement has been terminated);
- (e) they are, or have been, in an intimate personal relationship with each other.
- (f) they each have, or there has been a time when they each have had, a parental relationship in relation to the same child (see subsection (2));
- (g) they are relatives.

⁹ Under section 9(1) of the 2004 Act, Domestic Homicide Review means a review of the circumstances in which the death of a person aged 16 or over has, or appears to have, resulted from violence, abuse or neglect by— (a) a person to whom he was related or with whom he was or had been in an intimate personal relationship, or (b) a member of the same household as himself, held with a view to identifying the lessons to be learnt from the death.

or in some instances – like Barbara, drugs or alcohol. A resource¹⁰ created by Beyond the Streets has highlighted how drugs do become a survival need for some (particularly as drugs can be an adaptive coping strategy in response to trauma), but note that in their experience, substance misuse is often highly stigmatised due to services not seeing it as necessarily a 'need'.

4.40. Barbara during the scope of this review, informed a professional that she wanted to stop the survival sex – which is a further indicator of it being borne from her need.

4.41. Kiddo was 74 years old when Barbara murdered him. He was 30 years older than Barbara.

4.42. Due to their age and perceived vulnerability, older people are often targeted by criminals. Nevertheless there is no statutory definition of crimes against older people, nor is there any legislation which allows for a sentence uplift to be applied - as there is within hate crime offences.

4.43. Research¹¹ commissioned by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services in 2019 has highlighted the specific ways in which older victims of crime can be particularly vulnerable. Firstly, older participants of the research were identified as being more likely to have diminishing social circles and support networks. Secondly, poor health and a general sense of slowing down physically and mentally (that can come with increasing age) was identified as having a potential impact on the participants' ability to deal with challenges. As a result of these two factors, participants of the research disclosed that with age they felt more isolated, and more vulnerable and consequently in the event of experiencing a crime, they would benefit from additional support and communication. The research therefore concluded that better awareness of older victims' needs and identification of potential vulnerabilities (especially relating to the existence of a support network and any health conditions associated with ageing), could improve the quality and reception of police responses. However, the learning identified is, in the opinion of this author, applicable to all professionals responses.

4.44. This review recognises the diversity within the circumstances of older people and understands that not all older people are vulnerable and in need of support. However, Kiddo had disclosed loneliness, and because a lonely individual is more likely to accept contact from a criminal (and therefore become victim) - loneliness, along with isolation, is a known key risk factor which increases vulnerability for exploitation and the type of offending that was experienced by Kiddo.

Dissemination

4.45. Once agreement for the final report has been given by the Home Office Quality Assurance Panel, this domestic homicide Overview Report and/or an Executive Summary will be available on the council website and will be added to the Gov.UK online repository for DHRs (the decision to publish lies with the Partnership). The report will be suitably anonymised to protect the dignity and privacy of the family and to comply with the Data Protection Act 1998. Upon publication, partner agencies will be made aware, and the action plan will be shared with the agencies involved and members of the Assurance Learning and Implementation Group.

4.46. Subsequent to permission being granted by the Home Office to publish, this report will be widely disseminated to (including, but not limited to):

- Members of the Community Safety Partnership.
- The Police and Crime Commissioner for Nottinghamshire.
- The Domestic Abuse Commissioner.

¹⁰ [Survival Sex Resource](#)

¹¹ [Crimes against older people: Research commissioned by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services](#)

- Kiddo's family¹² (avoiding key dates such as birthdays and anniversaries).

4.47. The review has been assured by Nottingham Community Safety Partnership that the learning will be disseminated by means of partnership training and developed guidance.

5. Background Information (The Facts)

5.1. Kiddo was a private tenant. He rented a ground floor flat in the City of Nottingham.

5.2. At the time of the murder, Barbara had been staying with Kiddo for approximately two years. No-one else lived at the address. Kiddo's and Barbara's relationship is not confirmed to have been intimate.

5.3. At approximately 11:00 hours on a day in June 2023, a Housing Manager entered Kiddo's address after a neighbouring resident had become concerned that Kiddo had not been seen for about a week. The Housing Manager found the flat empty, though there was a smell of recent cooking and cigarettes.

5.4. The Housing Manager left the address but about an hour later, noticed a fire engine outside the property. Upon speaking to the Fire Officer, the Housing Manager established that Barbara had called them, claiming that she had locked herself out and had left a pan on the stove. The Housing Manager again entered the property - notably, there was no pan on the stove. Uneasy with the situation, the Housing Manager contacted the police and reported Kiddo as missing.

5.5. Later that evening, Police Officers attended the address. Upon entering the cellar, the Officers found Kiddo deceased. His body was badly decomposed, and he had suffered multiple stab wounds to his neck. The last known sighting of Kiddo alive had been 13 days earlier.

5.6. Barbara was declared a suspect and quickly arrested. As the investigation progressed, it became apparent that there had been fraudulent banking transactions on Kiddo's bank account since his death - one withdrawal had been successful (£300 in cash), and another had been declined. In addition, it was noted that around £20,000 had been withdrawn from Kiddo's bank account over the previous 18 months he had been alive.

5.7. A Home Office post-mortem concluded the cause of death to be 'stab wound to neck'; one of the multiple stab wounds had injured the carotid artery which had led to rapid death.

5.8. Following multiple police interviews, Barbara admitted to the murder of Kiddo and to carrying out a fraudulent withdrawal on his bank account (whilst disguised as him).

5.9. A Judge subsequently sentenced Barbara to life imprisonment, with a minimum of 25 years.

6. Chronology

Background of Kiddo and Barbara prior to the scoping period

6.1. Kiddo left school to work an apprenticeship before joining the Army where he served for 12 years. After leaving the Army, Kiddo worked as an Engineer.

¹² Family declined the support of an advocate during the course of the review, but support will be revisited when the report is to be shared.

6.2. In the early 1980's Kiddo married. He and his wife did not have any children together, but Kiddo's wife had a son from a previous relationship. Kiddo and his wife separated, and in around 2016 Kiddo moved into the address where he still lived when he was murdered. Kiddo and his wife remained on friendly terms.

6.3. Kiddo had siblings and extended family. He had regular contact with a sister and a nephew. The contact was mainly by telephone, but did include occasional visits to his flat, and Kiddo would sometimes attend football matches with his nephew.

6.4. Kiddo did not have a network of close friends and has been described by his sister as being friendly with everyone, but a bit of a loner.

6.5. Kiddo's ex-wife passed away in 2020, and Kiddo struggled with his grief. Following her death, and parallel with the Covid pandemic, it is recorded that Kiddo self-reported starting to consume three to three and half bottles of Vodka a week. Kiddo said that he had been a registered counsellor when he was younger, and he therefore had a good understanding of himself and he demonstrated insight into the need to stop smoking, reduce his alcohol intake, exercise, and improve his social interactions.

6.6. Barbara has two children who are now adults and from whom, this review has been advised, she is now estranged¹³. Following the death of her father when she was around 20 years of age, Barbara lived with her grandfather.

6.7. Barbara has reported drug use from the age of 20. She disclosed smoking and injecting¹⁴ heroin and crack cocaine and has said that she would 'work on the streets' to fund her drug habit. Though it is not known exactly when the survival sex work began, it is evidenced in police records that Barbara was actively working the streets when she was in her mid-twenties.

6.8. Barbara has 25 convictions dating back to 2005 which include prostitution offences, dishonesty offences and assaults. Of particular note is an offence dating from when Barbara was around 26 years of age in which she punched a 78 year old female in the face and used force to steal her handbag. Also relevant are the domestic incidents and assaults committed against her grandfather dating back to 2010. Barbara was convicted of assaulting her grandfather on four occasions and she received two custodial sentences; the most recent was a 39 month sentence imposed in 2019. These incidents stemmed from Barbara demanding money from her grandfather to pay for her drug habit.

6.9. Barbara's grandfather died (aged 99 years) whilst Barbara was in prison, but Barbara didn't report learning of this until after she had been released.

Chronology of Events

This section of the report is factual. It does not seek to analyse – only to describe key practice episodes that occurred within the scoping period of the case:

6.10. Barbara's release from prison

6.10.1. In October 2020 Barbara was released from prison where she had been serving a sentence for assaulting her grandfather. Upon release Barbara was subject to Probation Services supervision, and she moved into Approved Premises (with licence conditions) outside of the Nottingham City area.

¹³ It is thought that the eldest child hasn't lived with Barbara since being around 15/16 years of the age and the youngest since being about eight years of age.

¹⁴ Barbara sometimes suffered abscesses due to injecting drugs.

6.10.2. Within weeks of her release, and in line with process, Barbara's Probation Officer reviewed Barbara's risk assessment and assessed the Risk of Serious Harm posed by Barbara as

- High to her grandfather
- High to the public - most notably elderly and vulnerable people (this had previously been assessed as medium) and
- Medium to Police Officers and children.

Barbara was also assessed as posing a high risk of general re-offending and medium risk of violent re-offending. The factors assessed as being linked to this risk of reoffending and serious harm were noted to be accommodation; finances; relationships; drug misuse; emotional well-being; and thinking and behaviour. The assessment process included an 'Initial Sentence Plan' which contained objectives around increased awareness of the impact of offending behaviour, engaging with drug services improving coping skills and developing education, training and employability skills.

6.10.3. Barbara was served a notice to quit¹⁵ at the Approved Premises within months of her release from prison, owing to her having breached her curfew and testing positive for drugs¹⁶.

6.10.4. Excellent efforts were subsequently made by the Jericho Road Project¹⁷ to secure Barbara alternative accommodation. Barbara expressed wanting to return to Nottingham and she was moved into Emergency Housing in the Nottingham area while the Jericho Road Project continued to make housing referrals. However, due to Barbara's risk assessment¹⁸, not all accommodation was deemed suitable and therefore not all of the referrals were accepted.

6.10.5. Eventually Barbara moved into shared accommodation within a house which was opposite Kiddo's property.

6.10.6. Following the move, Barbara was referred to Clean Slate¹⁹ but it was a few months before Clean Slate managed to engage her in a face-to-face appointment. When Barbara did attend, she admitted that she had started to use substances again after leaving prison and said that she felt her drug-use was escalating - and that Methadone²⁰ might help. Barbara disclosed that she was back 'working the streets' to fund the drugs but that she wanted to stop. Barbara also discussed feeling anxious and depressed²¹.

6.10.7. Clean Slate, and the Jericho Road Project attempted to support Barbara, but her drug use and survival sex work continued. Following an allegation of aggressive behaviour against a female who also resided in the shared accommodation, professionals working with Barbara anticipated that she would again be evicted, and appointments were arranged for Barbara to meet with housing.

6.10.8. During a subsequent appointment with her Probation Officer, Barbara said that because of the eviction notice she was looking at supported accommodation over the road and that she had '*befriended an elderly bloke*' who resided there. The Probation Officer expressed concern about potential paralleling behaviour in terms of Barbara's index offence and her current circumstances - which indicated heightened risk concerns but did not identify any actions around this.

¹⁵ An Approved Premises stay is temporary; Barbara's bed was withdrawn one month before she was due to move on.

¹⁶ Barbara had been referred to Change, Grow, Live for drug support but had not engaged

¹⁷ Established in 2000, the Jericho Road Project is a registered charity that offers support to women who are involved in sex work or at risk at becoming involved in sex work.

¹⁸ Jericho Road understood the risk Barbara posed as they were aware of the conviction details and worked with Probation Services.

¹⁹ Clean Slate is a Criminal Justice substance misuse service within Nottingham Recovery Network.

²⁰ Barbara had a Methadone prescription when she was in prison.

²¹ Barbara had been under the Mental Health Team in prison but not in the community.

6.10.9. The 'elderly bloke' was Kiddo. Kiddo was not known to Probation Services, but he was known to a number of healthcare services which he regularly accessed as an out-patient, including plastic surgery; dermatology; ear, nose and throat; gastroenterology; hepatology; endocrinology; respiratory medicine; trauma and orthopaedics; rheumatology and the diabetic team. Notably a month before Barbara had told probation that she had befriended him, Kiddo had confided to staff during a hepatology appointment that his *alcohol intake had increased following the death of his wife in 2020*; and that *he was hoping that Covid restrictions lifting would allow him to exercise more and make some social contacts*.

Kiddo's Lived Experience

Following the breakdown of his marriage, Kiddo had relocated to an area which was unfamiliar to him, and which required multiple bus rides to reach his extended family.

The Covid pandemic presented significant challenges for Kiddo, particularly because he experienced the loss of both his ex-wife and stepson during this period. Additionally, Kiddo's health conditions made him particularly vulnerable to the Covid virus, potentially causing him to be especially cautious about contact with others, including family members. Interaction with others was therefore limited. Kiddo's family have informed the review that Kiddo enjoyed attending football matches; however, due to the virus, these events were now held behind closed doors. Consequently, Kiddo's contact with others during this time was primarily through his iPad.

He communicated to healthcare professionals that he hoped the lifting of Covid restrictions would allow him to exercise more and engage in social interactions. He also disclosed an increase in alcohol consumption and smoking.

It is, therefore, not surprising that Kiddo responded to Barbara's 'friendship' when she 'befriended' him.

6.11. Police Reports

6.11.1. In May 2021, Kiddo flagged down Police Officers to report that Barbara had knocked on his door asking for money (which he said had become a regular occurrence). Consequently Kiddo had withdrawn £50 cash from the cashpoint and given Barbara £30, but Barbara had then stolen Kiddo's wallet containing the other £20. Officers visited Kiddo later the same day, but Kiddo now said that it had been a misunderstanding and that his wallet had been found on the floor of his flat.

6.11.2. In August 2021, a neighbour of Kiddo's contacted the police to report that Barbara had asked her for money and when she had refused, had forced her way inside her address and bitten her hand. Officers attended Kiddo's flat to trace Barbara. Barbara was not there, but Kiddo told Officers that Barbara was regularly borrowing money for drugs and had moved her belongings into his flat. Although Kiddo said he was happy with Barbara living at his address, the Officers were concerned that he was being financially exploited by Barbara and overrode Kiddo's consent to submit an Adult at Risk Public Protection Notice²². However, subsequent assessment concluded that because Kiddo had not consented, and because Kiddo was not known to Adult Social Care, no further action would be taken.

6.11.3. Barbara was interviewed by police regarding the complaint of assault on the neighbour but because Barbara denied the offence and the neighbour did not want to pursue a complaint, no further action was taken.

6.11.4. In early September 2021 Kiddo attended his sister's address unexpectedly. He disclosed to his sister that he had 'woman trouble' and that a female was staying at his flat, but he wanted her to leave because he had given her all his money. Kiddo stayed at his sister's address overnight - which was out of character.

²² A Public Protection Notice is an information-sharing document that records safeguarding concerns about an adult or child. They are shared with partner agencies to inform a multi-agency response where appropriate.

The following day after Kiddo had left, Kiddo's sister rang the police for advice and a few days later she and Kiddo's nephew attended Kiddo's address hoping to help Kiddo move the female out of the property. However, Barbara was aggressive towards them on the doorstep and, unable to gain entry to Kiddo's address, they had to leave.

6.11.5. In the same month, Kiddo's bank contacted the police under banking protocol rules after Kiddo had attended to withdraw more money having already withdrawn around £15,000 during the previous four months²³. Officers attended the bank and spoke to Kiddo who said that he had allowed Barbara to move into his address 4/5 months ago and since then he had been paying for both of them and had also been giving Barbara money for her drug habit²⁴. Kiddo said that if he did not give Barbara the money, she would make him feel bad. Kiddo requested help to remove Barbara from his flat and as such Officers attended and escorted Barbara away with her belongings. She was told not to return, and Kiddo was told not to let her in. No offences could be pursued because Kiddo had capacity and had willingly given Barbara the money - but Officers were concerned that Kiddo would give Barbara more money if she requested and/or would allow Barbara to move back in with him and they submitted an Adult at Risk Public Protection Notice.

6.11.6. As a result, Nottingham Health and Care Point²⁵ contacted Kiddo to establish whether he met the criteria for a safeguarding enquiry under the Care Act 2014 but whilst Kiddo did request advice with finances (and was signposted to Welfare Rights), he did not describe any care and support needs. Adult Social Care referred Kiddo to the Slavery Exploitation Team²⁶ and closed their case.

6.11.7. Within weeks the Housing Manager contacted the police with concerns that Kiddo was being exploited by Barbara; Kiddo had unusually refused the manager entry, and a neighbour had said that Kiddo had been seen with bruising. Police Officers attended Kiddo who said that he did not want any police action and that his money and life were his to do with as he wished. Another Adult at Risk Public Protection Notice was submitted but upon review, it was concluded that like before Kiddo would not be deemed to meet the criteria for a safeguarding enquiry. Consequently the referral was not shared further.

6.11.8. Soon after, Barbara was recalled to prison by the Probation Service on the grounds that having failed to engage with the Probation Service, she had breached her sentencing and licence conditions.

6.11.9. In response to the referral to the Slavery Exploitation Team, a council Community Protection Officer contacted Kiddo. During the contact Kiddo said that he was getting back to normal and there had not been any further issues. Consequently the Slavery Exploitation Team closed the case.

Kiddo's Lived Experience

Initially, Kiddo welcomed Barbara's offer of friendship and sought to help her. Consequently, he permitted Barbara to temporarily reside with him when she faced accommodation difficulties, and he provided financial assistance when she asked.

However, over time, Kiddo realised the situation was becoming unmanageable. This prompted him to seek help from his family and to initially engage with police after his financial circumstances had been flagged by the bank. But by this time Barbara had exerted a form of control over Kiddo, and this affected his ability to accept support. Evidence of bruising reported by a neighbour suggests that Barbara may have been physically assaulting Kiddo, indicating that this control may have stemmed from fear.

²³ Kiddo had now spent all his savings and was in his overdraft.

²⁴ Kiddo told the police that Barbara is addicted to drugs and that he is also an alcoholic.

²⁵ Nottingham Health and Care Point is a non-clinical team that process referrals to a number of community services.

²⁶ The Public Protection Notice from the police was attached.

It must have been a relief when Barbara was recalled to prison.

6.12. Barbara's prison recall

6.12.1. Following Barbara being recalled to prison, Kiddo disclosed to his pharmacist during a medication review that he was drinking too much and that, although he spoke to his nephew on a weekly basis, he had no local friendships. The pharmacist referred Kiddo to the Social Prescribing Team.

6.12.2. The Social Prescribing Team successfully engaged Kiddo, and records show discussions around how Kiddo could improve his social interactions with others and reduce his smoking and alcohol intake. Kiddo said that he had lost confidence being around people he didn't know very well but that he was keen to join a cookery class or book club. Interestingly, Kiddo is recorded to have talked about a friend and having said that *'helping her, helps him'*. Presumably this was in reference to Barbara, but there is no evidence of this being further explored.

6.12.3. Kiddo's family has informed this review that Kiddo's bank statements evidence that he continued to send Barbara considerable monies whilst she was in prison. It is not known what this was for or whether he was under any pressure from any third party to send it.

6.12.4. When Barbara was next released from prison, she was not automatically managed under Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements²⁷, but because she had been served an additional sentence for a shop theft whilst in prison, she was now subject to Post Sentence Supervision²⁸.

6.12.5. Prior to Barbara's release from prison, the Jericho Road Project worked to address her housing, but when accommodation was eventually found, Barbara declined the offer stating that shared accommodation was not appropriate for her and that she wished to stay with Kiddo. This was reported back to Probation Services.

Kiddo's Lived Experience

Kiddo had respite from the abuse whilst Barbara was in prison but during this time he continued to send her money. It is not possible to determine whether there was any third party influence over this decision, but it is possible that in Barbara's physical absence, Kiddo reviewed their 'friendship' in an optimistic and positive manner. His comments in relation to him 'helping a friend – helped him' suggest that what he perceived to be 'acts of kindness' boosted his self-esteem and gave him a sense of fulfilment. Seemingly, Kiddo failed to recognise giving Barbara money as financial abuse at this time.

What is known is that during this period, Kiddo engaged with the Social Prescribing Team and spoke positively of improvements to his circumstances; he reported that his finances were improving and said that he was feeling better.

6.13. Barbara's prison release

²⁷ Having now served the full sentence in relation to assaulting her grandfather.

²⁸ In accordance with section 256AA of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (the 2003 Act), offenders will be subject to a Post Sentence Supervision period where: • The offender's offence took place on or after 1 February 2015; and • They received a standard determinate custodial sentence of more than 1 day but less than 2 years. • The offender is 18 years or older at the half way point of the sentence. Offenders who meet the above criteria are subject to a Post Sentence Supervision period as part of the community phase of their determinate sentence. The length of the Post Sentence Supervision period will depend on the length of the licence period, as the two combined will result in a 12-month long community phase. The Post Sentence Supervision period commences on the expiry of the licence period. The end point of the Post Sentence Supervision period is calculated by adding 12 months to the Conditional Release Date, as adjusted by relevant remand/tagged bail and unlawfully at large time. This means that generally the length of the Post Sentence Supervision period will be equivalent to 12 months minus the length of the licence period. The purpose of the Post Sentence Supervision period is the rehabilitation of the offender.

6.13.1. Upon her release from prison, Barbara recommenced her single person claim for Universal Credit requesting that her claim be paid into Kiddo's bank account and that his email address be used for her correspondence. Barbara told the Department for Work and Pensions (who were unaware of the previous allegations of financial abuse in relation to Kiddo) that she was co-habiting with Kiddo but that they weren't a couple.

6.13.2. Barbara was reportedly drug free at the time of her release from prison and initially said that she wanted to engage with Clean Slate for Relapse Prevention Interventions. However, Barbara soon admitted that she had immediately commenced drug use, had been spending large amounts of money on heroin and crack cocaine and was also smoking cannabis most days to help her sleep.

6.13.3. Within weeks of Barbara's prison release, Kiddo stopped answering calls from the Social Prescribing Team and his phone went 'out of service'.

6.13.4. Within three months of Barbara's release from prison, Kiddo's Housing Manager, contacted the police to report that Barbara had been asked to leave Kiddo's address but had locked herself in his bathroom. Officers attended and spoke to Kiddo who said he wanted Barbara to leave. He also disclosed that Barbara had broken his iPad but said that he did not wish to make a complaint. Barbara left the address in the presence of the Officers who demonstrated positive practice when they reattended Kiddo's address later that day to make sure that Barbara had not returned. During this visit, Kiddo said that Barbara had taken his mobile phone, and he wished to complain about this theft - but a few days later Kiddo said he had the phone back and no longer wished to pursue a complaint.

6.13.5. Around the end of 2022 and the beginning of 2023, healthcare professionals became increasingly concerned for Kiddo's health. He had been losing weight since the summer, but in February 2023 he disclosed that he wasn't *eating that much nor very nutritional food* because he didn't have the money. Kiddo said that he was struggling with the rising cost of living, which was not being reflected in his benefits and pensions.

6.13.6. Food parcels were arranged for Kiddo, and he was re-referred to the Social Prescribing Team. However it was now recorded that he no longer had a phone - which made him uncontactable. It is not clear what conversations were had around this or how professionals were assured that Kiddo would be able to respond to any support offers.

6.13.7. Possibly as a result of not having access to a phone, Kiddo had at this time also stopped contacting the community Podiatry Service for footcare; he had previously been seen at bi-monthly intervals, but his clinical management plan was that he would contact the service when he needed to be seen.

6.13.8. In relation to Barbara, her engagement with drug support and Probation Services was sporadic. Consequently her Probation Officer scheduled several enforceable face-to-face appointments – but Barbara failed to attend. Soon after these appointments had been issued, Barbara was allocated a new Probation Officer. It took the new Officer over a month to successfully engage Barbara but following this engagement, the newly appointed Probation Officer completed a safeguarding check in relation to Kiddo. However when the safeguarding check was returned - because Adult Social Care hadn't ever worked with Kiddo, it only indicated that Kiddo was not known to services.

6.13.9. Four months before Barbara murdered Kiddo, her Post Sentence Supervision ended.

Kiddo's Lived Experience

Kiddo was hidden in plain sight during this period.

Barbara had moved back into his flat without any professional consultation and without any disclosure of the risks she posed. Many professionals (who knew Barbara's background and history) were aware of the situation, but it was presumed that Kiddo was in agreement without any coercion or control.

In reality, Barbara was taking so much of Kiddo's money, that he was now unable to feed himself and she was also taking his possessions from him. Kiddo reported that Barbara had damaged his iPad and had taken his phone. This left him particularly vulnerable and isolated as he was now unable to maintain contact with either professionals or family and unable to call for help.

Kiddo must have felt powerless. He was trapped in his own environment and controlled by his 'friend'. Hereon the abuse was his daily existence. Barbara had worked hard to achieve this power and control, using strategies such as physical violence, isolation, degradation and threats. Her harm was cumulative and resulted in Kiddo's subordination and entrapment.

6.14. Incidents leading to the murder.

6.14.1. In May 2023, Kiddo bravely attended the Police Station to complain about intimidation from Barbara stating that she had been demanding money from him to fund her drug habit. Kiddo said that for the last three years Barbara had been coming to his flat once/twice a week and stopping over. He said that she would tidy his address and help him with household chores before demanding money from him - ranging between £20-£50 pounds. Kiddo said that he had previously told the police that everything was okay because he was worried what Barbara might do in the future.

6.14.2. Kiddo reported that

- he was now struggling for money,
- Barbara had punched him around six months ago - but not caused any injury, and that
- Barbara had damaged his radio.

6.14.3. In the first instance Kiddo declined the offer of the Officer immediately attending his flat and removing Barbara, stating that it was *all or nothing* as he didn't want her *kicking off*. However the following day, Kiddo re-attended the police station and said that he now did want Barbara removing as she had demanded more money. An Officer attended and Barbara packed her belongings and left. Kiddo consented to an Adult Concern Public Protection which, upon review, was shared with Adult Social Care.

6.14.4. The referral was sent to the Adult Safeguarding team, and an Adult Safeguarding Social Worker attempted to call Kiddo in response, but the contact numbers provided weren't recognised. The Social Worker contacted the Police Officer by email requesting an update of the situation and was told that: *the summary is that Kiddo does allow her to live there. He doesn't take any steps to safeguard himself and she seems to have more opportunities to steal from him but doesn't. It's a very odd situation where he clearly likes her company, and she gets money from him but doesn't take it too far, so police don't get involved.*

6.14.5. Unable to obtain any different telephone numbers, a Social Worker soon visited Kiddo's address. Barbara answered the door stating that Kiddo was visiting his sister, and she was at his flat to clean - in his absence. The Social Worker demonstrated positive practice when she told Barbara that she needed to enter the address. The worker recorded that it was clean - though it smelled of unknown substances. The Social Worker updated the police of the visit by email and police responded stating they would try and call at Kiddo's address.

6.14.6. Four days later the Social Worker further visited the address. Barbara answered again stating that Kiddo was still at his sister's. The Social Worker updated the police by email. Within the email, the Social Worker said *I feel as though he [Kiddo] should be treated as a missing person but of course, that's your decision.*

6.14.7. The following day, Barbara contacted the Social Worker to report that she was meeting Kiddo that afternoon and she would ask him to make contact. This was the same day that

- the Housing Manager entered Kiddo's address after a neighbouring resident had become concerned that Kiddo had not been seen for about a week
- the Housing Manager contacted the police reporting Kiddo missing after Barbara had called the Fire Service claiming that she had locked herself out and had left a pan on the stove, and the same day that
- Kiddo's body was found by the police.

(Notably, the day before, Barbara had attended the job centre asking to change the method of payment of her Universal Credit as she could no longer use Kiddo's bank account.)

7. Overview

7.1. Kiddo saw healthcare professionals on a regular basis. During the scoping period of the review he had self-reported loneliness and an increased alcohol consumption. Kiddo was offered support by means of a Social Prescribing²⁹ referral and a link worker successfully engaged Kiddo to co-produce a care and support plan to assist Kiddo to take control of his health and wellbeing.

7.2. Kiddo was also known to the police as reports had been made in relation to Barbara taking his money. Police enquired into the circumstances of the reports but for reasons that cannot now be unascertained, Kiddo was not able to support police investigations.

7.3. During the scoping period, healthcare professionals saw a decline in Kiddo's health and wellbeing; he started to lose weight, and he informed them that he had no money for food. Food packages were supplied.

7.4. The police reports in relation to Barbara taking Kiddo's money, and the decline in Kiddo's presentation weren't ever linked together.

7.5. Barbara was known to many agencies including the Police, Probation Services, Drug and Alcohol Services, Jericho Road Project and POW³⁰.

7.6. Agencies knew that Barbara lived with an addiction and that her need to pay for the addiction had previously led to aggressive and abusive behaviours - in particular against her elderly grandfather after he had refused her money for drugs.

7.7. During the scoping period, agencies knew that Barbara had started to use drugs again and that she was financing the addiction by 'working the streets'. Agencies also knew that Barbara was staying with Kiddo – an elderly male who lived alone.

8. Analysis

The analysis of the circumstances that have led to this Domestic Homicide Review, and which will respond to the review's terms of reference, is separated into three strands as follows:

- The Risk Assessment and Management of Barbara

²⁹ Social prescribing is part of the NHS Long-Term Plan's commitment to make personalised care business as usual across the health and care system.

³⁰ POW Nottingham is a non-profit, voluntary organisation supporting the rights of sex workers and those at risk of being exploited

- The Professional Recognition of Kiddo's increasing Vulnerabilities, and
- The Professional Challenges.

Risk Assessment and Management of Barbara

8.1. During the pre-release process in prison, Barbara (who had previously been managed by a Probation Service Officer³¹), was reallocated to a Probation Officer. There is nothing documented to evidence the rationale for this reallocation, but it was appropriate based upon the results of the most recent Offender Assessment System³² risk assessment review, which had

- amended the Risk of Serious Harm Barbara posed to her grandfather to high,
- maintained a medium Risk of Serious Harm to the public (most notably elderly and vulnerable people), and
- maintained a medium risk of Risk of Serious Harm to Police Officers.

8.2. The reallocated Probation Officer was a male practitioner. Records do not indicate whether consideration was given to assigning a female Probation Officer or if Barbara was asked for her preference, and notably, there is no evidence in Barbara's case notes to determine whether the gender of her Probation Officer is relevant to this review. However, authoritative research indicates that strong professional relationships are effective in changing offenders' attitudes and behaviour, and that such relationships are more influential than any specific method or technique³³. Therefore, it was crucial to assign Barbara a Probation Officer with whom she could establish a good professional relationship. And given that Barbara had disclosed prior abuse by a male, best practice would have been to discuss her worker preference with her.

8.3. Such practice is reiterated in the 2024 thematic inspection³⁴ *The Voice of Women on Probation*³⁵, which highlights the importance of individual approach and asking people for their preference of practitioner's gender. Interestingly the consultation reported that only 23% of the surveyed women had been asked whether they would prefer a male or a female practitioner – though notably most had automatically been given a female practitioner. However it is important to note that many of the women interviewed and surveyed did say that they were comfortable with a male practitioner - but importantly, those who did express a preference for a female practitioner often had specific reasons: either they had experienced abuse by men and therefore lacked trust in male practitioners, or they felt that a male practitioner might not fully understand gender-specific issues.

8.4. This review has been informed that current practice around working with females subject to probation supervision, suggests that where possible, allocation should be to a female officer and/or the preferences of the individual being managed should be considered. However, this practice was not in place at the time and when the male Probation Officer was allocated to Barbara there were significant workload pressures within the team. It is therefore possible that staffing resources led the allocation, and that the male Probation Officer was the one with capacity.

³¹ Probation Service Officers can manage low and medium risk cases. There is nothing noted within the records to indicate how the decision was made to allocate the case to a Probation Service Officer or evidence of any management oversight in terms of this decision.

³² Offender Assessment System (OASys) is the national Probation Service tool for recording the assessment of the risks and needs of a person on Probation. It is founded on evidenced based practice and is designed to be an integral part of the work which Probation Officers do in assessing offenders and identifying the risks they pose, deciding how to minimise those risks and how to tackle offending behaviour effectively. OASys supports practitioners in identifying and classifying offending-related needs, including basic offending patterns, personality characteristics and personal circumstances and the factors which underpin offending behaviour. It is used to indicate the risks the offender poses to the public, to the individual and other risks together with the level of the risk posed. The assessment can also be used to indicate the need for further specialist assessments.

³³ Council of Europe Probation Rules Commentary, 2010 [Supervision skills – HM Inspectorate of Probation](#)

³⁴ The consultation is part of HM Inspectorate of Probation's 2024 thematic inspection; the overall objective was to better understand how gender affects an individual's experience of probation, and using that insight, to create peer-led solutions to the problems women face.

³⁵ [Woman on Probation](#)

8.5. Irrelevant of gender, at the time that this Probation Officer was allocated, Barbara had been serving a prison sentence of over 12 months for the offence of assault. Consequently, she was automatically eligible for Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements³⁶ and this could have been reviewed at the point of re-allocation.

8.6. It is recorded on the management oversight contact that

- a referral to Probation Approved Premises³⁷ was required upon release, and
- discussions were needed around licence conditions,

but there is no evidence of the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements being reviewed.

8.7. Records do not explain why or how this review of the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements was missed, but Probation Services have reassured that monitoring has since improved and now includes

- flagging of eligible Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements cases and
- practitioners and the senior Probation Officer completing a form to determine the management level.

Additionally, systems are now in place to identify missing forms, which are reviewed every six months.

8.8. The utilisation and review of Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements is further discussed further later in this report.

8.9. Prior to Barbara's release from prison, a bed was allocated at an Approved Premises³⁸ (outside of the Nottingham area) and Barbara was issued with the conditions that she had to adhere to as part of her licenced supervision: namely that in addition to the mandatory licence conditions³⁹ she must:

- Not seek to approach or communicate with her grandfather without the prior approval of her supervising officer and/or Probation Officer
- Confine herself to the address approved by her supervising officer between the hours of 19:00 and 07:00 daily unless otherwise authorised by her supervising officer. (This condition was to be reviewed by her supervising officer on a weekly basis and could be amended or removed if it is felt that the level of risk that she presented had reduced appropriately.)

³⁶ The Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements are designed to protect the public from serious harm by sexual and violent offenders. They require the local criminal justice agencies and other bodies dealing with offenders to work together in partnership to manage the risks posed. Every 'Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangement' offender is identified in one of the four categories as follows:

- Category 1: Individuals who are subject to sexual offender notification requirements.
- Category 2: Violent offenders or other sexual offenders.
- Category 3: Other dangerous offenders, and
- Category 4: Terrorist or terrorist risk offender.

There are then three levels of Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements management - designed to ensure resources are focused on those individuals/cases requiring the greatest level of multi-agency co-operation. The level of management is determined by a robust process and should be regularly reviewed to ensure the agreed level remains appropriate.

³⁷ Probation Approved Premises provide intensive supervision for those who are assessed as posing a high or very high risk of serious harm. They play a role in terms of monitoring and managing the risks posed by residents as well as a programme of activities intended to support in the reduction in the risk of reoffending.

³⁸ Approved Premises are premises approved under Section 13 of the Offender Management Act 2007. They provide intensive supervision for those who present a high or very high risk of serious harm.

³⁹ Be of good behaviour and not behave in a way which undermined the purpose of the licence period

Not commit any offence

Keep in touch with the supervising officer in accordance with instructions given by the supervising officer

Receive visits from the supervising officer in accordance with instructions given by the supervising officer

Reside permanently at an address approved by the supervising officer and obtain the prior permission of the supervising officer for any stay of one or more nights at a different address

Not undertake work, or a particular type of work, unless approved by the supervising officer and notify the supervising officer in advance of any proposal to undertake work or a particular type of work

Not travel outside the United Kingdom, the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man except with the prior permission of the supervising officer or for the purposes of immigration deportation or removal

- Not enter an area of Nottingham, as defined by an attached map without the prior approval of her supervising officer
- Attend the specified Probation Office as reasonably required by her supervisor, to give a sample of oral fluid/urine in order to test whether she had any specified Class A or specified Class B drugs in her body, for the purpose of ensuring that she was complying with the condition of her licence requiring her to be of good behaviour.
- Not take any action that could hamper or frustrate the drug testing process

8.10. These additional conditions had been assessed by the Probation Officer as being required based on Barbara's risk profile. But given the connection between Barbara's substance misuse and offending behaviour, there was an oversight in not including a condition requiring Barbara to engage with drug support services. It has not been possible to understand why this condition was overlooked but it resulted in Probation Services being unable to mandate attendance or engagement with such services.

8.11. Barbara's drug testing (and her own admission) evidenced that very soon post-release; Barbara began to use substances again.

8.12. When Barbara failed the first drug test, the Probation Officer referred her to drug support services. This was apt, but it would also have been an appropriate time to make a formal request to vary Barbara's licence and to add the aforementioned missed condition - which would have enforced Barbara to engage with the drug support services.

8.13. Barbara failed two more consecutive drug tests over the next month.

8.14. The *Drug Testing and Drug Appointment Licence and Post Release Supervision Conditions*⁴⁰ outline that two consecutive positive tests or three non-consecutive positive tests (during a six week period following the initial test) should be a trigger for consideration of enforcement action. As such when Barbara tested positive on two consecutive tests, enforcement action could have been taken.

8.15. The reason why enforcement action wasn't taken has been discussed by the professionals engaging with this review and it has been suggested that it could potentially have been because Barbara was still waiting for her initial appointment with drug support services⁴¹ (following the referral made by Probation Services after she had failed her first test). However, when Barbara later failed to be effectively engaged with drug support services (and failed a further test), enforcement action should have been considered and discussed with a Senior Probation Officer. And given that a link between substance misuse and offending behaviour had already been identified, consideration as to whether the risks were escalating to a point where they could no longer be managed in the community.

8.16. Within months of Barbara's release from prison, her placement at the Approved Premises was terminated due to concerns regarding her engagement with the support offered by the Approved Premises, her drug use, and breaches of her curfew.

8.17. Probation Services have reflected that this was also a time at which formal enforcement action could have been considered - but the professional direction to work towards the Female Offender Strategy⁴², potentially influenced the decision not to.

⁴⁰ [Title](#)

⁴¹ Drug Support Services out of the Nottingham City area

⁴² https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/719819/female-offender-strategy.pdf

8.18. The Strategy, which prioritised increased support for vulnerable women in the community, implemented measures to divert women from contact with the Criminal Justice System and aimed to reduce the female prison population. Consequently, the Female Offender Strategy sought to shift the focus from prison to community-based solutions, and this approach is what potentially effected professionals to prioritise supporting Barbara to resolve her issues in the community over adopting punitive measures.

Learning 1: The Female Offender Strategy influenced probation professionals to prioritise providing support to Barbara in addressing her problems within the community rather than utilising enforcement action.

8.19. This review has been assured that this influence would not happen now as professionals have developed a better understanding of how to balance the offer of support services against risk to the community.

8.20. Nevertheless, at the time, a community-based solution for Barbara should have included a review of her Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements to consider whether Level 1 was still appropriate. Ordinary agency management Level 1 is appropriate where the risks posed by the offender can be managed by the lead agency in co-operation with other agencies but without the need for formal multi-agency meetings. As such, offenders should only be managed at Level 1 where the lead agency is confident that their Risk Management Plan is sufficiently robust to manage the identified risks.

8.21. Given that in order to manage Barbara's presenting Risks of Serious Harm her case now needed the active involvement and co-ordination of interventions from other agencies (for example, substance support, housing and the Jericho Road Project), level 2 active multi-agency management could have been considered. Level 2 would have demanded formal multi-agency meetings, and these would have supported information-sharing, and discussions between the agencies as necessary.

8.22. When reflecting upon why the opportunity to review Barbara's Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements was missed, it is worth mentioning that it was around this time that Barbara informed professionals that she had learned that her grandfather had died. Professionals have debated whether his death, and the subsequent removal of one of Barbara's risk factors, effected professionals to subconsciously lower all of the risk levels and consequently, the Probation Service as the lead agency remained confident that their Risk Management Plan was sufficiently robust.

Learning 2: The Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements were not effectively reviewed which resulted in a lack of consideration as to whether Barbara's case management would have benefitted from Level 2 arrangements.

8.23. This review has been assured that this learning is now addressed as per the improved monitoring described within paragraph 8.7 of this report. And additional further assurance of improvement to the review of Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements has been provided by the police, who have also recognised a training need and have commenced developments⁴³.

⁴³ In September 2024 the police created and began delivering a half day training session. This training is available to representatives from all relevant partner agencies which include Police, Probation, Prison, NHS, Youth Justice, Department for Work and Pensions, Adult Social Care, Children's Social Care, Housing and others. By March 2025 they had delivered 6 training sessions to a maximum of 240 people and had monthly sessions arranged with sessions being fully booked until July 2025, enabling a further 160 people to attend. In addition police had prepared a training session for Core Panel Members, from all agencies who sit on the Level 2 and Level 3 meetings. This session is aimed at raising awareness of the role of a core panel member and their requirements.

8.24. Upon being served a notice to quit at the Approved Premises, excellent efforts were made by the Jericho Road Project⁴⁴ to secure Barbara alternative accommodation. Barbara expressed that she wanted to return to Nottingham, so she was moved into Emergency Housing in the area while the Jericho Road Project continued to make their housing referrals.

8.25. Professionals involved with this review highlighted how limited female housing options are in Nottingham – particularly for offenders. Finding appropriate accommodation for Barbara with her complex needs and experiences was difficult. Notably based upon Barbara's risk assessment⁴⁵, not all of the accommodation was deemed suitable and consequently many of the referrals were not accepted. However Barbara was eventually offered shared accommodation within a house - which was opposite Kiddo's property and according to their website was '*supported accommodation [which] involves on hand support staff to assist people with complex needs*' and the '*staff provide mental health support, sports sessions and application support. Their aim is to teach basic life skills so that [the residents] gain confidence to live independently.*'

8.26. Whilst this property was a single sex provision catering for women, it was not an Approved Premises and given that prior to Barbara's release from prison it had been recorded that a referral to Probation Approved Premises⁴⁶ was required, positive practice would have seen managerial oversight from Probation Services in relation to this move. This didn't happen, and this review has been unable to establish why within its enquiries.

8.27. Having moved locality (and because Barbara continued to report that she was using substances), Barbara was now referred to a different drug support service in the area, Clean Slate. Initially Barbara couldn't be engaged with the service but owing to the omission of any condition on her licence to engage with drug support, no enforcement action could be taken by Probation Services (though recall action could have been considered under the 'to be of good behaviour' condition of her licence).

8.28. It was three months before Clean Slate was successful in engaging Barbara, but when they did meet, Barbara spoke openly about her drug use (admitting to smoking around three £10 bags of heroin and three/four £10 stones of crack-cocaine daily) and confiding that she continued to fund the drugs by 'working the streets'.

8.29. Barbara's engagement with Clean Slate hereafter was sporadic, as was her collection of her methadone prescription. It was positive practice that Clean Slate communicated this to Probation Services, who also shared that Barbara had potentially engaged in anti-social behaviour and had not attending a housing appointment.

8.30. In relation to Barbara's survival sex work, she was supported by POW whose outreach workers often saw her on the streets. However there was a suspicion that Barbara might also have been engaging in survival sex work at the accommodation as the housing provider reported to Probation Services that a number of males were attending Barbara's property. The Probation Officer discussed this with Barbara, and it was during this discussion that Barbara first referenced Kiddo; when she stated that she had *befriended an elderly bloke* who lived in supported accommodation across the road. Case notes from this discussion suggest a lack of professional curiosity into this situation - there is nothing to evidence that the Officer asked for more information (in this appointment or in subsequent appointments) but further details should have been sought

⁴⁴ Established in 2000, the Jericho Road Project works in a variety of practical and personal ways with women who are affected by the sex industry.

⁴⁵ Jericho Road understood the risk Barbara posed as they were aware of the conviction details and worked with Probation Services.

⁴⁶ Probation Approved Premises provide intensive supervision for those who are assessed as posing a high or very high risk of serious harm. They play a role in terms of monitoring and managing the risks posed by residents as well as a programme of activities intended to support in the reduction in the risk of reoffending.

to understand any potential vulnerability of Kiddo. Theoretically, the information acquired could have then supported safeguarding and police enquiries being made.

Learning 3: A lack of professional curiosity regarding the 'elderly bloke' Barbara said she had befriended, equated to a missed opportunity to explore any potential vulnerability and identify risk.

8.31. Professional curiosity is considered in more detail later in this report.

8.32. Despite the attempts to support Barbara's rehabilitation by means of offering community-based solutions, her drug use and behaviours in Nottingham continued as they had when she had been in the Approved Premises. And based on Barbara's Sentence Plan⁴⁷; the change of accommodation, continued drug use, and financial struggles evidenced that Barbara was at risk of reoffending and causing serious harm. Further evidence of risk was palpable from Barbara's now sporadic engagement with Probation Services - indicative of a lack of a strong professional relationship between Barbara and her Probation Officer. Which as previously mentioned, research has suggested is effective in changing offenders' attitudes and behaviour and is more influential than any specific method or technique.

8.33. Under National Standards Barbara was required to have a minimum of one appointment per week with her Probation Officer. Policy states that this should have been face-to-face but due to Covid-19 protocols, a blended supervision approach was being taken which enabled some appointments to be undertaken via telephone (Probation Officers could exercise professional judgement to determine how appointments would be arranged). For most of this time period, weekly appointments were offered to Barbara - though after six months, reporting was reduced to fortnightly because discussions had been held around reducing her assessed level of risk. The rationale for this reduction in risk is not clear but nevertheless a formal review did not ever take place and as such reporting should have remained weekly.

8.34. From when Barbara left the Approved Premises until she was recalled to prison around ten months later, Barbara had been offered 21 face-to-face appointments (of which five were attended) and 20 telephone appointments (of which 17 were attended). Barbara offered a range of explanations for her absences relating to personal crisis and health, but on some occasions no explanation was recorded⁴⁸ and there is no evidence of follow up action. Despite Barbara's engagement with Probation Services being poor enough to have potentially led to enforcement, only one of the missed appointments was enforced when a warning was issued.

8.35. Barbara's compliance with the mandatory licence condition of 'good behaviour' also came into question during this time period when the housing provider reported to Probation Services that another resident had accused Barbara of assault. Barbara denied the allegations, but the information was never verified. Had it been, and had the allegation been proven likely true, this incident could have resulted in Barbara's recall.

8.36. Instead, as it was now clear that Barbara could be evicted from her current accommodation, focus turned to addressing Barbara's housing needs. Housing appointments were arranged but Barbara did not attend, and she soon informed her Probation Officers (Barbara now had two Probation Officers⁴⁹) in a meeting

⁴⁷ Which had linked accommodation, finances, relationships, drug use, emotional well-being, and thinking and behaviour to risk posed by Barbara

⁴⁸ Whilst most appointments were recorded and notes updated by the Probation Officer there was a period where the notes did not include any record to evidence why decisions had been made around making absences acceptable. National Standards requires that all contact notes are updated within 24 hours of an appointment. The Probation Officer cited workload pressures at the time as being a factor in this happening.

⁴⁹ In June 2021, Barbara's case started to be co-worked with another Probation Officer (in training) joining her current Practitioner. As part of the training process, staff are required to 'co-work' high risk cases to develop an understanding of this type of work. The new Probation Officer had been employed as a Probation Service Officer prior to commencing her training and was therefore experienced in working with individuals on Probation. All relevant safeguarding and domestic abuse training had been completed, and this Practitioner was a female member of staff who had a keen interest in working with Women on Probation.

that she had voluntarily left her accommodation and was staying with the *older bloke across the road*. One of the Probation Officers advised that the address would have to be approved, and Barbara confirmed the address (it was Kiddo's). There is no evidence of any further query into the address or its occupant.

8.37. At this time Barbara was still recorded on probation's Offender Assessment System and nDelius⁵⁰ risk register as posing a high risk⁵¹ of serious harm to vulnerable/elderly people. Consequently, checks should have been made around Kiddo immediately; Kiddo should have been contacted; police and social care checks should have been undertaken, and a home visit should have been considered. Probation report that they have record of a police check being requested by a Probation Officer a couple of weeks later, but there is no evidence of the police Multi-Agency Intelligence Team having received it and it has not been possible for this review to understand what happened.

8.38. This review has been assured that since this time; Probation Services and the police have worked together to improve the process in relation to information requests and have introduced a form which is now sent directly to the police intelligence department. This more formal and organised request system is resulting in timely returns, but the process has been further reinforced by means of guidance for Probation Service practitioners to chase any outstanding requests that aren't received in a timely manner. In addition, a Probation staff member is now seconded into the police Multi Agency Intelligence Team - this has supported the embedding of the Police checks, escalation process and a dashboard to monitor whether these have been undertaken in all relevant cases.

8.39. Whilst there is evidence of the agencies involved with Barbara's support offer communicating with one another around this time, consideration could have been had to convening a multi-agency meeting. Notably, this course of action was open to every agency and there are two likely potential reasons why it didn't happen. Discussion by professionals identified that firstly, agencies are often unsure about whether it is appropriate to convene a meeting and/or what type of meeting to initiate, and secondly, when there is a lead agency such as in this case; Probation Services, other agencies presume that they will lead on any necessary action.

8.40. The information brought to this review suggests that not all professionals are confident to convene a professionals' multi-agency meeting. This is common learning in safeguarding reviews and not surprising when it is considered how professionals' meetings mean something different to each agency. But what all agencies should understand is that they:

- Can be a one off or regular meeting – called when a discussion with other professionals is needed
- Can be called at short notice in a crisis
- Can be used to discuss specific cases, care and treatment, incident, risk, professional challenge or disagreement etc.
- Can be called by any agency

8.41. Had any professional convened a meeting, agencies would have very likely recognised that Barbara

- was now using large amounts of drugs and not engaging with support,
- needed large sums of money to fund the drugs,
- was not engaging consistently with probation,
- had been accused of assault,
- was a known risk to older people, and
- was potentially homeless but living with an *elderly bloke* she had *befriended*.

⁵⁰ nDelius is a browser based, national probation service case management system,

⁵¹ Documentation suggests that Probation Officers had discussed with a Supervising Officer that whilst there were ongoing concerns, there did not appear any longer to be evidence of an imminent risk of serious harm so it was agreed Barbara could be reduced to medium risk. However this was not amended on documentation.

8.42. This information when pieced together would have supported professionals to recognise that the risk Barbara posed was not being effectively managed in the community and discussions around this should have led to Probation Officers seeking managerial oversight. And, as per the 2016 National Probation Service Effective Practice Team Guidance, a reassessment of risk, and the Risk Management Plan.

8.43. Instead agencies worked mostly in siloes and their focus remained upon Barbara's rehabilitation as opposed to the risk she potentially posed to the public.

Learning 4: Agencies focussed upon their own remit within Barbara's rehabilitation and in working predominantly in siloes, lost sight of the risk she posed to the community if rehabilitation wasn't proving successful.

Recommendation 1: Nottingham Community Safety Partnership should seek to review and re-issue guidance on all multi-agency meetings to support practitioners' to recognise a legitimate reason for getting together and to empower them to lead and convene professionals' meetings and/or refer to another meeting forum, as appropriate. Nottingham Community Safety Partnership must work with agencies to ensure that the information is thereafter known, and easily accessible, to all professionals.

8.44. Barbara soon disclosed to one of the Probation Officers, an incident with one of Kiddo's neighbour. Barbara denied any wrongdoing but explained that the neighbour had called the police alleging that Barbara had bitten her. Barbara told probation that she had agreed to a voluntary police interview.

8.45. In the first instance Probation Services needed to verify Barbara's account and then consider whether Barbara's current risk assessment remained the same and/or whether the Risk Management Plan needed updating, but there is no evidence of Probation Services exploring the incident with the police.

8.46. This review has learned that there is a partnership portal through which probation can send intelligence about any subject that sits outside of the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements forum, and that probation have a number of contacts within the police, i.e., they can contact the 'Managing Sexual and Violent Offenders and Violent Other Offenders' unit re Sex Offenders, the 'Integrated Offender Management' unit for acquisitive crime offenders, and the Multi-Agency Intelligence Team for other enquires via the probation enquiries form. And information on all individuals 'Released On Licence' is sent to the Force Intelligence Bureau.

8.47. Notably, had Probation Services initially shared their Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements level 1 intelligence with the police, the police would have known, that Barbara, a level 1 offender was living within their community and could have updated Probation Services when she came to their attention.

8.48. But regardless, members of the police service are responsible for ensuring that they share information appropriately as part of their day-to-day practice and there is no evidence of any Officer delving into Barbara's information, as an alleged perpetrator, and on account of her most recent criminal conviction, contacting Probation Services to see if she was known to them and to share the information. Whilst Officers dealt efficiently and appropriately with what was reported to them at the time, they notably found themselves having to close the investigation due to insufficient evidence. This did not mean that a crime had not been committed, and even if the threshold had not been met for a strategy meeting in relation to section 42, police should have shared the information with Probation Services.

8.49. Likewise, the following month it was Barbara (not the police) who informed Probation Services⁵² that Kiddo had told the police that he wanted her removed from his property but had then later changed his mind and allowed Barbara to stay. Kiddo's change of decision is discussed later in this report, but it is noted to follow patterns observed in relationships involving domestic abuse, where individuals may seek support and then withdraw for various reasons, potentially including coercion.

8.50. This lack of communication and information sharing between Probation Services and the police resulted in missed opportunities to review Barbara's Risk Management Plan and to consider enforcement action.

Learning 5: There is an identified need for establishing a communication pathway between Probation Services and the police for sharing information concerning violent offenders and domestic abuse perpetrators.

8.51. This review has been informed that as a result of this review the police Multi-Agency Intelligence Team has already started to work with Probation Services to improve their information sharing systems and all information sharing between police and probation is currently under review to assess if the current arrangements are fit for purpose.

Recommendation 2: Nottingham Community Safety Partnership in collaboration with Nottingham Safeguarding Adults Board, must gain assurance and understanding of the continuing work between Probation Services and the police in relation to improving their communication and information sharing processes, and seek evidence of improvement.

8.52. In time, due to Barbara failing to reside as directed and failing to attend appointments, a decision was taken by Probation Services that she be recalled to custody under a standard recall⁵³. This decision was correct as it was evident that the risks were not being successfully managed in the community.

8.53. Recall aims to protect the public and Barbara needed to have a constructive prison experience with the goals being:

- Rehabilitation - to support successful re-release and resettlement
- A review of her case, and a
- Timely and appropriate re-release.

8.54. A Review of Recall Report was completed. To complete this report, a post-recall three way meeting should have convened with the Community Offender Manager, the Prison Offender Manager and Barbara, in order to set the perspective for Barbara's recall, rebuild professional relationship breakdowns and focus on what Barbara needed to do in terms of working towards her re-release. However this review has been informed that in this instance, due to an emergency within the prison, this meeting could not go ahead.

8.55. Nevertheless, the report correctly highlighted a number of outstanding risk issues to be addressed before release could be considered; it was suggested that Barbara would need to engage with drug treatment and mental health services and source appropriate accommodation as well as displaying increased motivation to improve her engagement. And records indicate that Barbara did demonstrate positive engagement throughout the sentence.

⁵² Probation Services later shared this information with The Jericho Road Project.

⁵³ A standard recall means that you are returned to custody for an undetermined length of time which could be until their sentence expiry date for determinate sentence prisoners.

8.56. During this period in custody, Barbara was further sentenced in relation to a shop theft and received an additional two months in custody. Consequently it was known prior to Barbara's automatic release on her Sentence Expiry Date⁵⁴ that upon her release, though she would no longer be eligible to Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (having completed her sentence), she would be made subject to Post Sentence Supervision⁵⁵⁶.

8.57. Eight standard supervision requirements are applied to Post Sentence Supervision as follows:

- To be of good behaviour and not behave in a way which undermines the purpose of the post-sentence supervision period.
- Not to commit any offence.
- To keep in touch with the supervising officer in accordance with instructions given by the supervising officer.
- To receive visits from the supervising officer in accordance with instructions given by the supervising officer.
- To reside permanently at an address approved by the supervising officer and obtain the prior permission of the supervising officer for any stay of one or more nights at a different address.
- Not to undertake work, or a particular type of work, unless it is approved by the supervising officer and notify the supervising officer in advance of any proposal to undertake work or a particular type of work.
- Not to travel outside the UK, the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man except with the prior permission of your supervising officer or for the purposes of immigration deportation or removal
- To participate in activities in accordance with any instructions given by the supervising officer. (This activity can be accredited programmes; one to one work with a supervising officer; mentoring by a former offender; or other relevant activities as offered by probation.)

But there are only two additional conditions that can be added. Those being:

- To partake in drugs testing.
- To attend drug rehabilitation appointments.

8.58. Neither of these two additional requirements were requested in Barbara's case (this was an unexplained omission by the Probation Services). It is possible for a Probation Officer to amend Post Sentence Supervision licences post release; however this was not done.

8.59. To explain, whilst the Post Sentence Supervision conditions somewhat mirror the mandatory licence conditions, they are not licence conditions. During a licence period, a breach of a licence condition can result in return to custody through recall. This is not available during the Post Sentence Supervision period; instead breaches are responded to by means of warning letters (up to three can be issued) and then can be brought before the courts who can impose a further period in custody (up to 14 days), a fine, or a Supervision Default Order which can include a specified number of Unpaid Work Hours or a Curfew.

8.60. Prior to Barbara's release from prison, referrals were made to the Nottingham Women's Centre and the Jericho Road Project, who collaboratively tried to support Barbara to secure suitable accommodation for release. Professionals report that it was difficult to secure accommodation for Barbara owing to her previous history of being abusive, but eventually accommodation was identified. However Barbara declined it on the grounds that she did not like shared accommodation. Consequently under the Duty to Refer, the Women's Centre referred Barbara to the housing authority, but Barbara did not present at the ensuing appointment.

⁵⁴ In respect of the custodial sentence she was serving for the offences against her grandfather - the shop theft sentence had run concurrently

⁵⁵ Technically, Barbara was subject to licence supervision for two days as her release date was actually a Sunday and she had to be released on the Friday in lieu of the two days, because the prison service cannot release people on a weekend.

⁵⁶ Please refer to footnote 18 for guidance to Post Sentence Supervision

8.61. It is notable that whilst Barbara was in prison, Probation Services had reviewed the Offender Assessment System and reduced Barbara's Risk of Serious Harm from high to medium. This effected Barbara no longer being eligible for Approved Premises upon her release. But, as identified above, one of the requirements of Post Sentence Supervision is to reside at an address approved by the supervising officer. Therefore when Barbara told a resettlement worker that if she were released homeless, she would stay at Kiddo's property, his address should have been assessed for suitability. Had an assessment of the address been undertaken, it would not have been approved by the Probation Service. As part of an assessment around the suitability of the proposed address, Kiddo should have been contacted to discuss the situation and to gain his perspective.

8.62. Additionally, whilst this review is primarily considering the risk Barbara posed to Kiddo, it should be noted that professionals who were visiting Kiddo to support him, for example the Housing Manager, were unaware that they were now attending a property frequented by an individual who was known to pose a risk to some members of the public. Consequently the Housing Manager asked how, when professionals from statutory agencies know that an individual who poses a risk to the public, is living or frequently visiting an address they manage, could the information be shared with private landlords to support them in protecting their workers.

8.63. Probation Services confirmed that whilst Barbara was under Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements, a disclosure could have been agreed. Any disclosure would have needed to be completed without breaching data protection laws; but for example, it could have been decided to advise Kiddo's landlord that workers should not attend the property alone.

8.64. Thereafter, when Barbara was no longer subject to Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements, the review learned that there is now a process to allow disclosure to be considered. There is a form for professionals to complete and submit to the police, who will determine whether it is necessary and proportionate to disclose information to another party and will agree on the terms of what should be shared and who is best placed to share it.

8.65. Furthermore positive practice would have seen Barbara being notified that her residence at the accommodation she had been offered was a direction until alternative accommodation was approved and that failure to have an approved address would place her in breach. Though it has not been possible to verify for certain, Probation Services suggest that this was overlooked because of the influence of a Pilot scheme that had been introduced in the East Midlands Probation Area in respect of changing the way those subject to Post Sentence Supervision were managed.

8.66. This Pilot had been introduced to achieve a number of aims including:

- to reduce the 'unproductive enforcement' in Post Sentence Supervision as this contributed to the revolving door of sort custodial sentences, and
- to '*change the nature of Post Sentence Supervision so that it was more in keeping with the rehabilitative spirit of the legislation*'.

As such the Pilot approach focused on supporting and empowering those under Post Sentence Supervision in their desistance by supporting them to have significant contact with professionals to access advice and rehabilitative input.

8.67. The expectation was that anyone who was considered eligible would be part of the Pilot – and Barbara met the criteria⁵⁷. Any decision to exempt her would have required Senior Probation Officer approval and there is nothing to evidence that exemption was ever sought or discussed.

8.68. Probation Services have reported that interviews with staff during this review have revealed that practitioners were, at that time, adopting a more passive approach towards enforcement when interpreting the Pilot scheme's guidance. It is important to note that the Pilot scheme is no longer in place, and new guidance has re-emphasised the importance of enforcement.

8.69. Following Barbara's release, Barbara's Probation Officer completed a further Offender Assessment System which deemed Barbara as medium Risk of Serious Harm to

- the public - most notably elderly and vulnerable people, and
- Police Officers and children.

The factors assessed as linked to the risk of reoffending and serious harm remained as before.

8.70. The assessment also included a new Initial Sentence Plan in which concerns were expressed in relation to Kiddo who Barbara had returned to reside with. The assessment noted that little information was known about Kiddo and that he could be vulnerable. However there is no evidence of any mitigation of this risk, or of attempts to seek further information. As mentioned, checks should have been undertaken with the police and Social Care, and conversation should have been had with Kiddo himself.

8.71. This was a missed opportunity to learn of the information now held by other agencies about Kiddo which would have supported further assessment; for example, the bank's concerns as reported to the police, Kiddo's reports and responses to the police, the subsequent referral to the Slavery Exploitation Team and the concerns self-disclosed by Kiddo in relation to his isolation and alcohol use - which demonstrated his vulnerability.

8.72. The Probation Service has identified that this opportunity could have been missed because the Initial Sentence Plan did not require countersignature by a Senior Probation Officer. As such there was no additional management oversight which may have prompted further discussions around risk management.

8.73. Probation wasn't the only agency to learn that Barbara was living with Kiddo; Barbara told Clean Slate who consequently raised a concern to Probation Services in relation to Kiddo's potential vulnerability. This was positive information-sharing practice by Clean Slate which could have been further improved by means of a safeguarding referral. Though, as is discussed later in this report, Adult Social Care did not open a safeguarding enquiry until later in the scoping period based upon the fact that Kiddo did not have *care and support needs*, agencies should still submit concerns as they arise - even when they recognise that the circumstances may not automatically meet the threshold for a Section 42 enquiry.

8.74. And safeguarding didn't have to stop there – like before when concerns arose, there wasn't anything stopping Clean Slate (or any agency) from additionally convening a professionals' multi-agency meeting. Such a meeting would have reviewed what was known by agencies about Kiddo's circumstances, what was known about Barbara and also could have considered the wider community - had any other people in the locality been affected by similar exploitation perpetrated by Barbara.

⁵⁷ Post Sentence Supervision Pilot cases should have been recorded on nDelius with standard wording to explain the rationale for the decision - this was not done in Barbara's case, and this review has been unable to establish why. However, Probation Services have informed this review that the agencies working with Barbara were informed that she was subject to the Pilot.

Learning 6: A rehabilitative focus on Barbara lost sight of the risks she posed to others.

8.75. To respond to this learning, this report has already confirmed that in regard to overlooking risks when Barbara was

- subject to licence conditions; it was the influence of the Female Offender Strategy, which had led probation professionals to prioritise supporting Barbara to address her issues within the community rather than enforce penalties. This would not occur now as professionals have a better understanding of how to balance support services with community risk.
- under Post Sentence Supervision, it was the influence of the Pilot scheme which led to probation professionals adopting a more passive approach towards enforcement and the new probation reset guidance aims for a more balanced approach.

8.76. There continued to be concerns regarding Barbara's irregular involvement with support agencies, which were similar to those observed while she was under licence, but because neither of the two additional requirements in relation to drugs had been requested in Barbara's case, her poor engagement with drug services could not constitute any action; and as mentioned, it was not possible for Probation Services to add the requirements in retrospect.

8.77. Barbara's Probation Officer did discuss Barbara with supervision round this time and submitted an intelligence check to the police. This review has had sight of the Intel Form and has observed that the date search parameters had been set to start from when Barbara was released from prison post recall. Consequently none of the incidents between Barbara and Kiddo are mentioned as they occurred before Barbara's recall to prison.

8.78. The aforementioned Pilot guidance had specified that a minimum of two enforceable appointments should be offered to those subject to the Post Sentence Supervision Pilot, and it also suggested that Offender Managers may set up three monthly non-enforceable contacts if the Post Sentence Supervision period is over three months (Barbara's was seven months). And further enforceable appointments could be arranged in light of any emerging risk concerns.

8.79. In line with the guidance, following the *emerging risk concerns* (i.e., the problems concerning Barbara's engagement with agencies), the Probation Officer scheduled several enforceable (face-to-face) appointments, which Barbara failed to attend. These appointments could have been enforced but instead it was agreed with Senior Probation Officers that re-engaging Barbara was the priority. (It is noted that Senior Probation Officers were unaware that throughout this period, in addition to not engaging with support services, Barbara was still residing with Kiddo without appropriate enquiry or approval. Had Senior Probation Officers been aware of this they may have suggested enforcement.)

8.80. Very soon after these failed appointments, Barbara had to be allocated a new Probation Officer. This review has been unable to effectively analyse the handover as there are no notes to indicate what risks, concerns and next steps were highlighted to the new practitioner. But without doubt, the change in worker would have affected the continuity of Barbara's supervision and it is possible that Barbara's new Probation Officer did not realise that the previous Practitioner had been trying to arrange an appointment with Barbara *in light of emerging risk concerns* – rendering the appointment enforceable.

Learning 7: When a new Probation Officer is allocated a case, there should be a thorough documented handover to reflect what has been discussed.

8.81. Probation Services have informed that in relation to cases being allocated; under current standard practice the allocation would be clearly outlined, and it would be recorded on the system that before the case can be moved, a full handover is required and must be documented. In the event of an emergency, for example, where a practitioner has already left the service, the senior Probation Officer would be expected to record the suitability of the case to the newly allocated practitioner and to record the expectation that the incoming practitioner appraise themselves of the situation by reading the case notes. Probation Services have reported improvements in the recording and monitoring of recording.

8.82. The reallocation of Probation Officer had been discussed with Barbara in advance, and it is known that Barbara was somewhat resistant. Barbara had said that she didn't want a new Officer and that she thought the Post Sentence Supervision was due to end anyway, *'so if that means going back to jail so be it'*. She had also said at this time that she was going to meet with the Jericho Road Project as she needed help with banking, benefits and accommodation because Kiddo wanted her to leave, and she had described that she was having a difficult time and felt run down.

8.83. The Probation Officer had confirmed the Post Sentence Supervision end date and stressed that the allocation of the case was for support. There is no evidence of any further conversation being had in relation to why Kiddo wanted her to leave.

8.84. Barbara did not initially respond to the new Probation Officer's attempts to arrange a telephone appointment, and it is recorded that it was a month before any further attempts were made – which further suggests that the new Probation Officer did not recognise the priority of the appointment or the reasons behind it.

8.85. Barbara responded to the Probation Officer the month before her Post Sentence Supervision was due to end, and during a telephone call she advised that she

- was still living with Kiddo
- was not in receipt of methadone
- was using two bags of heroin and one bag of cocaine daily (spending at least £40 but sometimes over £100 a day)
- sometimes used cannabis to help her sleep
- was funding her drug use through survival sex work, and
- wasn't engaged with health services.

8.86. Following this appointment, the Probation Officer completed a safeguarding check in relation to Kiddo and referred Barbara back to drug support services. However given the correlation between Barbara's circumstances and the level of risk she potentially posed; consideration could have also been had at that time of

- convening a multi-agency professionals meeting - particularly given the end of probation involvement the following month, and
- instructing Barbara back into an office appointment.

8.87. The safeguarding check revealed that Kiddo was not known to services, indicating that Adult Social Care had not previously engaged with Kiddo. This provided some reassurance to Probation Services as it suggested that Kiddo did not have care and support needs that rendered him vulnerable. However, considering his age, it was likely that Kiddo would have had an element of vulnerability and therefore, a case discussion with supervision would have been advisable to explore potential options for obtaining further information about Kiddo - to assess any vulnerability unknown to Adult Social Care.

8.88. The safeguarding check only considered whether Kiddo had ever been subject to Adult Social Care services. It therefore did not reveal the Public Protection Notices that Police Officers had submitted, nor did it disclose that one of the Public Protection Notices had led to Adult Social Care speaking with Kiddo and whilst he had been deemed to not have care and support needs, there had been a referral to the Slavery Exploitation Team.

8.89. Professionals involved in this review discussed how regardless as to whether Kiddo was known to Adult Social Care or not, or had known care needs or not, he (and others like him) was still vulnerable to exploitation. Consequently a range of checks are required to support professionals to obtain a fuller picture because when it comes to exploitation, relying on the Care Act thresholds is not appropriate.

8.90. A conversation with Kiddo's housing manager would have proved effective at this time.

Learning 8: Further risk assessment and professional enquiry was required to gather the knowable information and to support better identification of the risk of exploitation.

8.91. The safeguarding check was only the starting point of the enquiry. Improved and continuous professional curiosity would have seen further information being sought and triangulated from other sources. Professional curiosity is addressed within a recommendation later in this report.

8.92. Four months before Barbara murdered Kiddo, her Post Sentence Supervision ended. The risks to Kiddo had not reduced. If anything they now increased as Barbara was able to do as she wanted without any professional oversight.

8.93. The Independent Chair, Independent Author and review panel members have all acknowledged that this section of this report leans heavily upon Probation Service practice and information. This is reflective of their lead role working around Barbara, but the described reliance of the other agencies upon Probation Services to address issues, serves to highlight the need for all agencies to ensure that their professionals are

- confident to convene professionals meetings,
- able to professionally challenge one another and are
- pro-active in relation to chasing any outstanding information and/or actions.

8.94. Furthermore, it is very important to highlight the significant pressures that Probation Services staff were under during the scoping period of this review owing to a reunification within the service. This reunification had extensive implications for the workforce as two agencies were essentially merged into a new system that had not previously existed. It occurred in June 2021, but there was an extended embedding period marked by considerable staff movement of roles and the allocation of new cases.

Professionals recognition of Kiddo's increasing vulnerabilities

8.95. Prior to Barbara commencing her exploitation of Kiddo, he had been living alone for several years, having separated from his wife and moved into his current address (in 2016). And though he was friendly with a neighbour with whom he would regularly chat; it seems that Kiddo didn't know many people in the neighbourhood. Kiddo's family have said that they have never understood why Kiddo chose a property in the area that he did; Kiddo travelled by public transport, and it required multiple bus journeys to visit them from his new accommodation. This resulted in some isolation for Kiddo. Kiddo's landlord has suggested to this review that it is possible that there were limited properties available at the time that Kiddo needed to move.

8.96. At the beginning of the scoping period of this review Kiddo was grieving. His ex-wife, whom he had remained close to, had sadly passed away during the Covid pandemic. And the restrictions that the pandemic had continued to rule, had further contributed to resultant feelings of loneliness and isolation. Documentation suggests that Kiddo first confided this to staff during a Hepatology appointment in March 2021 when it is recorded that he said that his *alcohol intake had increased following the death of his wife in 2020*; and that *he was hoping that Covid restrictions lifting would allow him to exercise more and make some social contacts*. There is nothing documented to evidence whether Kiddo was signpost to any support services in response to this disclosure or whether there was any exploration had with Kiddo in relation to his next of kin and who was available within his family network to offer support.

8.97. As an ex-military gentleman, Kiddo could have been signpost to the Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Families Association⁵⁸ (SSAFA) in Nottinghamshire. The association helps the armed forces community in a number of ways. Its focus is on providing direct support to individuals in need of physical or emotional care and it is committed to helping individuals to overcome problems, including addiction, relationship breakdown, debt, homelessness, post-traumatic stress, depression and disability.

8.98. Kiddo could also have been referred to Age UK⁵⁹ at this time. Age UK could have thereafter had a conversation with Kiddo in order to understand what help and support could be offered in terms of his grief, loneliness and domestic arrangements. If Age UK had concluded that their in-house service wasn't suitable to support Kiddo, they would have made onward referrals (which this review has been advised would have included consideration of the aforementioned Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Families Association).

8.99. Additionally Kiddo could have been referred to the Social Prescribing Team. Social prescribing plays a crucial role in initiatives aimed at combating loneliness. It allows GPs, nurses, and other health and care professionals to refer individuals to various local, non-clinical services. It acknowledges that an individual's health is influenced by a range of social, economic, and environmental factors and aims to address these needs in a comprehensive manner. Social prescribing programs may include activities offered by voluntary and community sector organisations, such as volunteering, arts activities, group learning, gardening, befriending, cookery, healthy eating advice, and different sports. Notably, later in the scoping period, Kiddo was referred to Social Prescribing and happily engaged.

8.100. It was important to signpost Kiddo for support because social isolation can not only affect an individual's physical and mental health, but it can also increase their vulnerability to exploitation, particularly if they are made to feel valued by the perpetrator and offered a sense of companionship.

8.101. Police records identify that Officers learned much later in the scoping period from Kiddo that Barbara had told him early in their 'friendship' that she was homeless, and she had asked if she could stay for two nights. This is corroborated by Kiddo's family who have informed the review that Kiddo eventually confided that he and Barbara had gone for a drink, and he had started to feel sorry for her and had agreed to her staying for a couple of nights.

8.102. Following this 'offer', Barbara moved her belongings in to Kiddo's address and began to manipulate him into using his savings to fund her drug habit.

8.103. A key mechanism of this manipulation was the redirection of Barbara's benefits into Kiddo's account. By using Kiddo's bank account (and his email address) for her Universal Credit, Barbara effectively merged their financial identities. The Department for Work and Pensions has confirmed to this review that such

⁵⁸ [Nottinghamshire | SSAFA](#)

⁵⁹ There is no strict age for a referral to Age UK, but most are 50 years plus.

arrangements are not uncommon for claimants experiencing homelessness or lacking documentation; consequently, the use of a third-party account did not trigger internal concerns. For Barbara, however, this served a dual purpose: it provided a veneer of legitimacy to her residence and if any professional looked at the account, the presence of Barbara's money could be used to mask the fact that she was draining Kiddo's finances, and it could superficially look like Barbara was contributing to the household.

8.104. Furthermore by having her money go to his account, Barbara ensured she had a 'legitimate' reason to demand access to Kiddo's banking details, PINs, or the physical bank card. The Department for Work and Pensions noted that they verify bank accounts by seeing the physical card; in this instance, because Kiddo had willingly (albeit under manipulative circumstances) provided his details, their verification process was satisfied. By using Kiddo's email address for her correspondence, Barbara likely also gained access to his digital life. This effectively placed Barbara as the gatekeeper to Kiddo's external communications, increasing the social isolation already noted in this report.

8.105. This exploitation occurred within a safeguarding gap between two different arms of the Department for Work and Pensions. As a State Pensioner, Kiddo had no legislative requirement to engage with them, rendering his increasing vulnerability invisible. Conversely, while the Department for Work and Pensions had frequent contact with Barbara and were aware of her status as an offender, they were not notified of the nature of her offences or any MAPPA status. Without this specific risk information, they viewed Barbara solely as a vulnerable claimant rather than a potential perpetrator.

8.106. Barbara's systematic takeover was made possible because she exploited Kiddo - who has been described by his family as a mild-mannered, friendly gentleman, and took advantage of his kind-hearted nature from the beginning, by making him feel sorry for her. Notably, the conversation with staff during the Hepatology appointment occurred one month before Barbara informed Probation Services that she had 'befriended' an 'elderly bloke' who lived in the self-contained flats across the street. Kiddo's self-described situation of grief and social isolation would have made him more vulnerable to Barbara's actions and would have helped to create conditions conducive to potential exploitation. This is evidenced in a study⁶⁰ undertaken in 2022 which concluded that increased loneliness and social dissatisfaction predicted subsequent increases in financial exploitation vulnerability - and could therefore be an imminent risk factor for exploitation.

8.107. Therefore, in light of Kiddo's loneliness, it is reasonable to assume that he would have initially welcomed Barbara into his life as a friend.

8.108. In the study *Perceived Types, Causes, and Consequences of Financial Exploitation: Narratives From Older Adults*⁶¹ (thought to be one of the first studies to systematically collect qualitative data from older adults who have experienced one or more incidents of financial exploitation throughout their lives), participants were asked to share how they believed their financial exploitation was able to occur. Almost all the participants stated that there was an *element of trust* associated with the event or persons involved with the event. Many participants stated that friends and family are supposed to be trustworthy, and thus, the index of suspicion for financial fraud when interacting with family and friends is low. Some participants described incidents that involved strangers who "*became friends*," which established trust.

8.109. Interestingly some participants in the study when asked to consider the causes of financial exploitation, described themselves as trusting and of having the tendency to "give people the benefit of the doubt." Four

⁶⁰ Lim, A. C., Mosqueda, L., Nguyen, A. L., Mason, T. B., Weissberger, G. H., Fenton, L., ... Han, S. D. (2022). Interpersonal dysfunction predicts subsequent financial exploitation vulnerability in a sample of adults over 50: a prospective observational study. *Aging & Mental Health*, 27(5), 983–991. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2022.2076210>

⁶¹ [Perceived Types, Causes, and Consequences of Financial Exploitation: Narratives From Older Adults - PMC](#)

participants stated that older adults are “easy targets” and “vulnerable” because as one of the participants summarised, “People in my generation are pretty trusting. We were raised to trust.”

8.110. The events leading to Barbara’s exploitation of Kiddo mirror the participants’ theories; Barbara first built a ‘friendship’ which in turn led to an element of trust before she quickly moved in to Kiddo’s accommodation, trapping him and controlling him in his own environment.

Learning 9: Loneliness is a widespread experience; however, when it becomes prolonged and persistent, it can significantly impact an individual’s health and heighten their susceptibility to exploitation.

Recommendation 3: Nottingham Community Safety Partnership must seek assurance from agencies that loneliness is acknowledged as a feature of safeguarding within their guidance and training packages.

8.111. This review is assured that loneliness is starting to be addressed within Nottingham and Nottinghamshire because in 2021, in response to Covid, a partnership-based group known as The Tackling Loneliness Collaborative⁶² formed. At the time of writing this report, the membership stands at 256 people representing a range of statutory and voluntary organisations.

8.112. The Tackling Loneliness Collaborative aims to

- Undertake research to understand loneliness, map resources and measure the impact of activity to tackle loneliness in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire.
- Raise awareness of loneliness and the support and information available to tackle it. And,
- Seek opportunities to work together, being inclusive of people with lived experience and from diverse communities, and influence change to tackle loneliness.

8.113. The Tackling Loneliness Collaborative work has progressed, and they now have a website that references research and resources for professionals to use with those they are supporting, and it is also a place that highlights and brings to life the “Friendly Connectors” within communities.

8.114. The sustainability of the Tackling Loneliness Collaborative network is a key focus, and Tackling Loneliness Collaborative is exploring the possibility of establishing itself as a formal organisation/body, such as a charity or trust. This transition would enable Tackling Loneliness Collaborative to secure funding independently, reducing reliance on external partners and ensuring long-term viability. By formalising its structure, Tackling Loneliness Collaborative will be able to access a broader range of funding opportunities, strengthen its governance, and enhance its ability to support communities effectively. This strategic move aims to provide stability and resilience, which will allow Tackling Loneliness Collaborative to continue its impactful work well into the future.

8.115. Professionals who initially became aware of a ‘connection’ between Kiddo and Barbara fell into two categories. They either knew the risk that Barbara posed but didn’t understand Kiddo’s vulnerabilities, or they knew of Barbara but knew nothing about her or the risk she posed. Both Barbara’s risks and Kiddo’s vulnerability was ‘knowable’ information but was not effectively sought – even when, as we move through the scoping period of this review, there is an increasing professional concern around the ‘friendship’ between Kiddo and Barbara, with some professionals reporting their concerns to the police and/or referring to safeguarding in line with practice protocol.

⁶² [About the TLC | Bassetlaw CVS](#)

8.116. One of the subsequent barriers professionals faced in relation to supporting Kiddo, was that Kiddo was unable to maintain engagement with services. For example, during conversations with the police at the bank, Kiddo initially disclosed that

- Barbara had moved into his address,
- he had been paying the rent and food for the both of them, and he had been
- giving Barbara sums of money.

And at first Kiddo said that he wanted Barbara to move out. However in later conversations, Kiddo told Officers that his money was *'his to do with what he wished'*.

8.117. This response is not unusual from a victim of exploitation, and it is important that professionals do not take such an 'about-turn' at face value. Instead they should consider it in line with an individual's potential vulnerability and co-dependency.

8.118. Kiddo's co-dependency on Barbara will have started with his genuine concern and compassion. His family have described his personality, and kindness was a core personal attribute. Consequently in the beginning, as already mentioned, Kiddo probably welcomed Barbara (given that her 'friendship' would have helped his loneliness) and he likely gained an element of personal gratification from knowing that he had been able to help a 'friend'. It is unlikely that Kiddo would have recognised his mis-placed humanity until it was too late; by which time he had lost his savings and many of his possessions had been sold.

8.119. Kiddo telling the Police Officers at the bank, that he wanted Barbara out, is evidence of his growing recognition into the situation. As is the occasion when Kiddo sought refuge with his sister for a night and confided that he had 'woman trouble'. So the question is – why, when professionals later approached Kiddo, was he unable to continue with his disclosure of exploitation. And why was he unable to accept the subsequent support offered by his sister and nephew when they attended his address to help him to remove Barbara.

8.120. In answer, it can be scary for people to report experiences of exploitation and abuse, especially for those who have none or little knowledge or understanding of what happens procedurally after they have made a report. Kiddo may have been taken by surprise when the bank contacted the police, and this element of spontaneity could have potentially aided his initial disclosure. However after returning to his flat and having time to reflect, Kiddo later denied further support.

8.121. This 'change of heart' could potentially be evidence of coercion and fear. It is not unusual for a victim to be intimidated by a perpetrator; and violence and threats from Barbara towards Kiddo are evidenced retrospectively when,

- Kiddo reported to the police that historically Barbara had said to him *"I would never hurt you!", "I do know some people that would though"*.
- Kiddo disclosed Barbara had historically punched him. And potentially when,
- A neighbour reported to the Housing Manager that Kiddo had been seen with bruises.

8.122. Kiddo like many other victims, may have lacked confidence in the ability of statutory services to protect him from Barbara. Consequently Kiddo may have been scared into shielding Barbara and putting up with her behaviour. Kiddo's family agree that fear contributed to Kiddo's inability to support intervention, and they also cite pride and embarrassment.

8.123. Though written in relation to how the criminal justice system’s response to domestic abuse can be reformed, the following data into why victims don’t tell police (offered within the report, *Shifting the scales: Transforming the criminal justice response to domestic abuse*⁶³), is applicable:

Reason	Percentage
Too trivial/not worth reporting	43%
Didn’t think they could help	32%
Embarrassment	22%
Didn’t think the police would do anything about it	19%
Private/family matter/not police business	18%
Didn’t want the person who did it to be punished	17%
Some other reason	16%
Didn’t think they would believe me	9%
Thought it would be humiliating	8%
Fearred more violence as a result of involving the police	7%
Didn’t want to go to court	7%
Dislike/fear of police	5%
Didn’t think the police would be sympathetic	5%

8.124. Following Kiddo declining further support, Police Officers submitted an Adult at Risk Public Protection Notice. This evidences that despite Kiddo saying he was ‘okay’, they did recognise that he was still at risk. Thereafter, police representatives working within the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub reviewed the referral and considered it against guidance provided by the Adult Social Care team in relation to whether he would meet their remit of care and support needs⁶⁴. It was concluded that he did not and consequently the referral was not shared. The Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub Safeguarding Team has assured this review that in the event of Adult Social Care criteria not being met, other sources of support are still considered but, as it was unknown to the Safeguarding Hub at this time that Kiddo was ex-military or isolated – no other support services were deemed apt.

8.125. The Independent Office for Police Conduct reviewed all of the reported incidents in relation to Kiddo and Barbara and whilst there were no findings of misconduct against any Officer, the review did focus on the function of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub and the sharing of Public Protection Notices by the police with Adult Social Care. The review identified that once a Public Protection Notice is completed and sent to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub team, the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub Reviewing Officer appear to deal with the Public Protection Notice in isolation - without reviewing any information provided in previous Public Protection Notices for the individual concerned.

8.126. The Independent Office for Police Conduct therefore stated that Nottinghamshire Police should consider implementing a process wherein the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub team review existing Public Protection Notices to look for patterns of behaviour relating to an individual and the timings of incidents if they involve the same person, to assist them when making a decision to refer an incident to the local authority.

8.127. As a result of the Independent Office for Police Conduct review, from September 2024 a new policy has been introduced by Nottinghamshire Police in both City and County Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs and in the event of an initial decision not to share a Public Protection Notice with Social Care, the reviewing Officer will now review the last 12 months previous Public Protection Notices linked to the nominal. This is to ensure that there is no relevant further information or repeat concerns that may influence that decision.

⁶³ [Shifting the scales: Transforming the criminal justice response to domestic abuse \(accessible\) - GOV.UK](#)

⁶⁴ Notably, this decision was verified when a month later, a further Public Protection Notice was shared with Adult Social Care with the same outcome.

8.128. If this policy had been implemented during the scoping period of this review, when the police submitted their third Public Protection Notice after the Housing Manager had raised concerns, the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub would have identified that two previous Public Protection Notices had been submitted in the prior two months. This third concern was not shared following review, but the presence of this policy might have influenced that decision.

8.129. There are other occasions whereby Kiddo changed his narrative and was unable to accept further support. For example, when Kiddo first reported that Barbara had stolen money from him, he later informed the police that he had found his wallet and that it had been a misunderstanding. As mentioned, this behaviour whereby individuals seek support and then withdraw, follows patterns observed in relationships involving domestic abuse; including coercive control and/or in relation to trauma bond⁶⁵ – whereby Barbara would have sought to justify her actions and portrayed herself to Kiddo as a friend. Which is why professionals needed to employ robust professional curiosity instead of taking Kiddo's word at face value.

8.130. Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Adult Board has a 7-minute briefing⁶⁶ in relation to professional curiosity on their website but to further add, professional curiosity is accomplished by using an array of skills which include the ability to observe, listen, ask direct questions, and contemplate and verify information. It requires a professional to:

- not accept information at face value
- not make assumptions
- triangulate information from different sources (including looking at past information/case notes) – in order to gain better understanding
- be conscious of unconscious bias, and
- be respectfully nose.

8.131. Professional curiosity is a concept which has been recognised as important within the area of safeguarding for many years and is a well-known theme identified in many Safeguarding Reviews. However, though it is an essential component of safeguarding procedures, and its application is rooted in safeguarding adult policies and the Care Act 2014, being professionally curious is still not always embedded into practice - as is evidenced in this review.

Learning 10: Professionals needed to be 'curious' by asking questions and thereafter verifying information from alternative sources, as required to gain an effective understanding of the circumstances.

8.132. It is not proportionate to this Domestic Homicide Review to delve deeper into the barriers and challenges that professionals continue to face in regard to professional curiosity, but additional scrutiny is necessary to ensure that agencies are working effectively to protect individuals at risk in the future.

8.133. Nottingham Recovery Network has shared an example of additional scrutiny by means of a current ongoing audit focused on professional curiosity within their service. This is positive practice, but it is acknowledged that auditing such matters poses challenges and may be difficult to replicate in other services.

8.134. Professionals engaged with this review mooted how professional curiosity could potentially be enhanced by incorporating prompts in paperwork. For example, by adding a question at the end of

⁶⁵ Trauma bonding is the attachment an abused person feels for their abuser, specifically in a relationship with a cyclical pattern of abuse. Contrary to the widely popularised use of the term, trauma bonding does not mean the two people are bonding over shared trauma.

⁶⁶ [professionalcuriosity.pdf](#)

assessments that asks the assessor to identify any concerns or issues they have noticed during the session, and to consider possible questions or actions to alleviate them or understand them better.

8.135. The Slavery Exploitation Team shared that their training offer incorporates professional curiosity and encourages professionals to ask themselves, *'is there anything else I could do?'*

Recommendation 4: Agencies must evidence to Nottingham Community Safety Partnership that that they are prompting and encouraging their professionals to be professionally curious, and Nottingham Community Safety Partnership must gain an improved understanding of how to support agencies with this practice.

8.136. Additionally, though it is recognised that confidentiality requires careful consideration, involving family in Kiddo's safeguarding could have offered valuable support. For example, when Officers struggled to engage Kiddo following both the bank and the housing manager raising concerns, consideration could have been had of contacting Kiddo's sister - who had by that time already contacted the police with concerns around Kiddo's welfare (following him seeking her assistance and disclosing his problems with Barbara).

8.137. A closer relationship between the police and family members may have helped Kiddo to engage with the police to support prosecutions around assaults and theft/damage of his personal property.

8.138. The police didn't ever attempt further contact with Kiddo's sister to enlist support following her initial call. Whilst the force has not been able to establish why this was overlooked, professionals involved in this review discussed how worries around breaching data protection, and receiving complaints if they override consent, can be barriers to contacting family members.

8.139. A further barrier professionals faced in relation to how to support Kiddo was in relation to him meeting the criteria for a safeguarding enquiry. To further explain, section 42 of The Care Act (2014) sets out the criteria for Adult Safeguarding, which places a statutory duty on the local authority to protect adults who:

- have needs for care and support
- are experiencing, or at risk of, abuse or neglect; and
- as a result of those care and support needs are unable to protect themselves from either the risk of, or the experience of abuse or neglect.

8.140. Notably, abuse includes financial abuse and includes having money or property stolen, being defrauded, being put under pressure in relation to money or other property and having money or other property misused.

8.141. In relation to the Care Act criteria creating barriers for professionals; the Housing Manager discussed the challenges faced when they tried to convey concerns about Kiddo's frailty to Police Officers and expressed that they felt that their concerns were not taken seriously. Further discussion revealed that while the Housing Manager is appropriately considering Kiddo's overall vulnerability, Police Officers submitting Public Protection Notices, adhere to the criteria set forth in the Care Act 2014 and pre-empt the relevant thresholds outlined above. Adult Social Care explained that this is because who their Social Workers work with, is governed by the Care Act Eligibility Criteria, necessitating proof that individuals receiving support meet the statutory criteria.

8.142. Age UK advised that their organisation is available to provide support when a person is not deemed to reach thresholds, and the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub additionally indicated that if a Public Protection

Notice is submitted and does not meet the threshold for Adult Social Care, other support referrals will be considered at that time.

8.143. Where the above Care Act criteria is met, there is a local authority duty to carry out an enquiry to decide whether action should be taken and if so, what and by whom (section 42(2) of the Act). This can range from a conversation with the adult at risk through to a formal multi-agency plan of action.

8.144. In response to the safeguarding concern shared with them, Adult Social Care spoke with Kiddo - but during the conversation Kiddo neither disclosed any problems nor said that he wanted Barbara removing from his property. Adult Social Care also spoke with Kiddo's GP Practice who confirmed that they had no concerns about Kiddo's health and social care. Consequently the decision was made that because Kiddo had no identified eligible Care Act needs, the criteria for a safeguarding enquiry was not met but that he would be referred to the Slavery Exploitation Team.

8.145. This was positive practice because adult safeguarding responsibility is broader than just those situations that can progress to a safeguarding enquiry; there is a shared responsibility across organisations to address risks to wellbeing and safety, whether through safeguarding responses or through alternative support pathways.

8.146. The Nottingham City Council Slavery Exploitation Team was formed in 2019 in response to the identification of a number of cases where individuals were being held in slavery or being exploited but their case had no ownership from statutory services.

8.147. The Slavery Exploitation Team has dedicated Officers who work with partners to identify and tackle exploitation, (and modern slavery and trafficking) and offer support to survivors. The Team triages referrals, liaises with other agencies, conducts low level investigations, and offers specialist guidance to professionals and advocates for survivors.

8.148. To ensure a multi-agency approach to identification, prevention and management of cases, the Team incorporate a monthly Slavery Exploitation Risk Assessment Conference which unites statutory and non-statutory agencies to discuss suspected or known cases and to plan a joint response to manage risk and intervene.

8.149. The Slavery Exploitation Team referral informed that Adult Social Care had closed Kiddo's case and outlined the concerns - explaining that Barbara had moved in with Kiddo around four or five months earlier and that since that time Kiddo had been giving Barbara money - spending approximately £15,000. The referral informed that the bank had contacted the police about this, and that Kiddo had said that when Barbara asked for money, if he said no, she would beg him, and this would make him feel bad so he would give it to her. It further explained how the police had helped to remove Barbara from the property, but Officers were concerned that Kiddo might give Barbara more money and/or she would move back in.

8.150. The Slavery Exploitation Team subsequently liaised with the police and asked whether a further visit had taken place. They also emailed the street outreach team and POW to see if Barbara was known to them. POW replied explaining that they were aware of Barbara but hadn't had any engagement for 18 months and street outreach said no involvement for three years.

8.151. In time, owing to the police struggling to resource a Police Officer to revisit Kiddo, a Community Protection Officer from the council visited him. Kiddo told the Community Protection Officer that he was

getting back to normal and that there were no further issues. However unbeknown to the Slavery Exploitation Team, Barbara had by this time been recalled to prison.

8.152. Following feedback from the Community Protection Officer, the Slavery Exploitation Team reflected upon whether Kiddo was suitable to be discussed in the aforementioned Slavery Exploitation Risk Assessment Conference and concluded that it did not seem proportionate given that Kiddo had confirmed that the abuse had stopped. Ergo, the Slavery Exploitation Team closed the case but notably, the Team were not aware that whilst Kiddo had been open to them,

- his Housing Manager had raised a further concern to the police in relation to Kiddo being exploited by Barbara.
- Kiddo's sister and nephew had attended Kiddo's property in an attempt to help him to move Barbara out but had been met at the door with aggression and abuse from Barbara, and Kiddo had asked them to leave. Or that
- The police had submitted a further Public Protection Notice to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub, which had not been shared with Adult Social Care.

8.153. The first and latter above situations, being known to professionals could have warranted a further referral to the Slavery Exploitation Team. Conversation with professionals involved with this review has highlighted that this likely didn't happen because many professionals have not heard of the Team and/or are unsure of what they do and/or how and when to refer.

8.154. Had another referral been made to the Slavery Exploitation Team, it is possible that Kiddo would have become subject to a Slavery Exploitation Risk Assessment Conference and a multi-agency joint response to manage risk and intervene would have been planned.

Learning 11: Many professionals remain unaware of the Slavery Exploitation Team.

Recommendation 5: Nottingham Community safety Partnership in collaboration with the Slavery Exploitation Team must raise awareness of the Slavery Exploitation Team within partner agencies and support agencies to embed referrals into their guidance and processes.

8.155. This review has been informed that since the time Kiddo was open to the Slavery Exploitation Team, many new processes and procedures have been implemented. They include:

- The Team now has a standardised list of agencies to contact re every referral (Police, Adult Social Care, Nottingham University Hospitals, Department for Work and Pension and Mental Health Services) and an extensive list of agencies to be considered depending on the information given. As such, if Kiddo's case was referred to them now, the Team would likely receive more information about both Kiddo and Barbara from the start.
- RAG ratings were developed by the Slavery Exploitation Team in August 2022⁶⁷. RAG stands for Red, Amber, Green - and is a traffic light system used to risk assess and more effectively manage cases referred into the team. There are 10 identified areas of risk
 - housing,
 - disabilities,
 - substance use,
 - mental health,
 - agency involvement,
 - immigration status,

⁶⁷ From August 2022 – March 2023, 131 closed cases had at least 1 RAG rating completed. There was a total of 539 RAG ratings completed, which is an average of 4 RAG ratings per case.

- risk of going missing/absconding,
- ability to risk assess/keep safe/access services,
- police incidents/hospital presentation,
- slavery/exploitation/trafficking.

These areas support risk assessment and help caseworkers explore potential referrals.

- A team member now permanently represents the Slavery Exploitation Team at the Sex Worker Network Meeting⁶⁸ panel. The following morning the rest of the Slavery Exploitation Team is updated in the Team briefing, and the minutes are saved for reference.
- The Team also now log 'linked individuals' on a centralised document so that they can cross reference names heard at other panels to see if they have had previous involvement.

8.156. These changes have not been implemented in response to Kiddo's case but have been a natural progression based on developed knowledge and expertise and in recognition that exploitation mirrors domestic abuse processes. And as such, exploitation processes need to mirror those followed within domestic abuse. This review is assured that the newly implemented processes and procedures will effect a more robust response to circumstances such as Kiddo's in the future.

8.157. Kiddo's family have informed this review that bank statements evidence retrospectively that whilst Barbara was in prison, Kiddo continued to send Barbara substantial amounts of money⁶⁹. Clearly some influence remained but nevertheless, Barbara being recalled to prison provided a window of opportunity for professionals to try and engage Kiddo without Barbara's presence and to explore what he understood of exploitation and financial abuse and to signpost him to appropriate support.

8.158. It was positive that the Social Prescribing Team engaged Kiddo well during this time but unfortunately the Team, though aware of Kiddo's grief, loneliness, increased alcohol consumption and desire to socialise and exercise more, was not aware of Barbara or the recent concerns that had led to the involvement of the police and the Slavery Exploitation Team. Had the Social Prescribing Team been aware they could have tried to support Kiddo by ensuring that he knew what help was available should Barbara, or someone similar, return into his life.

8.159. It has been established that the Social Prescribing Team wasn't aware because the information they initially work with is what is received in the referral and in Kiddo's case the referral came from his pharmacist - who wouldn't have known about the exploitation. Thereafter, the team work to support the individual with whatever they identify within their discussions and during the development of their care and support plan – and Kiddo didn't disclose any concerns around Barbara.

8.160. In relation to signposting Kiddo for support with Barbara's behaviours, whilst this review is a Domestic Homicide Review, agencies involved have highlighted that at no point during the scoping period would it have been appropriate to signpost Kiddo to domestic abuse services. This is because as previously mentioned, the relationship between Kiddo and Barbara⁷⁰ did not fit the criteria within the Domestic Abuse Act 2021, and therefore incidents would not have been classed as domestic abuse incidents.

⁶⁸ A monthly professionals' meeting where information and concerns are shared amongst partner agencies about individuals involved in sex working who may be at risk.

⁶⁹ It remains unknown what this was for, or whether there were other third parties influences in the community.

⁷⁰ Only Kiddo and Barbara can ever know the true dynamics of their relationship and whether it was intimate or not. Kiddo described Barbara as his friend, but on one occasion Barbara did tell Police Officers that they had had a sexual relationship. However there is nothing further to support this and it may have been an attempt by Barbara to justify her presence at the address.

8.161. Nevertheless, professionals involved with this review identified that there are definite benefits to be had from looking at domestic abuse procedures and protocols and considering how domestic abuse practice could be adapted and applied to support victims of exploitation.

8.162. Had Kiddo been a survivor of domestic abuse perpetrated by Barbara it is likely that following the police reports which indicated that Barbara could impact Kiddo's safety, Officers would have disclosed relevant information to Kiddo in relation to Barbara's offending history. And such a disclosure would have been accompanied by a robust safety plan tailored to Kiddo's needs which would have included detailing any protection orders available to him should he require support. For example, in a case of domestic abuse; Non-Molestation Orders, Restraining Orders, Domestic Abuse Protection Orders and Stalking Protection Orders. Such tools provide an additional support for managing the risk posed by perpetrators by enabling courts to impose a range of conditions.

8.163. The National Police Chiefs' Council, Violence Against Women and Girls Taskforce has been working with a technical consulting firm to develop a simple to use PowerApp⁷¹ which can work in any police force in the United Kingdom and will support front-line Officers to be more effective in using protective orders to safeguard potentially vulnerable victims. The new App uses a yes/no decision-making option format which leads Officers to the most appropriate order. This could prove a useful tool in circumstances such as Kiddo's in the future.

8.164. Part of a police response to high-risk domestic abuse is consideration of a panic alarm. Taking into account that later disclosures made by Kiddo highlighted Barbara's propensity to use physical violence and to take or damage his property, a panic alarm would have been a useful tool for Kiddo. Had Kiddo had a panic alarm; he would have been less dependent upon finding a phone when he required immediate assistance.

8.165. Additionally, when notified of a single or repeated occurrence of domestic abuse, many agencies will add a flag or domestic abuse warning marker to the case file of both the victim and perpetrator. This ensures that professionals are aware of the concerns and risks in future contacts and can incorporate appropriate safeguarding into their practice. This review has learned that there is no similar marker in relation to a victim of exploitation and/or a perpetrator of exploitation but that a Place of Interest Information Marker could have been placed on Kiddo's address to alert Police Officers attending incidents that Kiddo was a vulnerable victim, potential repeat victim, and the reasons why.

8.166. Had a marker been placed against Kiddo a more robust response may have been affected when Kiddo later went to the police station in May 2023 and disclosed intimidation from Barbara stating that she demanded money from him to fund her drug habit.

Learning 12: Marking Kiddo's address as a Place of Interest might have prompted a stronger response to later incidents.

Recommendation 6: Nottingham Police must review the criteria and use of their Place of Interest Markers in relation to repeat victims of crime and ensure that the updated criteria is implemented across the force and incorporated into training.

⁷¹ www.pols.police.uk/contact

Learning 13: Valuable learning from the identification and protection of domestic abuse victims is not replicated in exploitation safeguarding processes which is allowing exploitation victims to remain unsupported and at risk.

8.167. This learning point (13) must be respected within the action plan in relation to Recommendation 7 later in this report.

8.168. A further consideration around the support offered to Kiddo was whether Kiddo had the mental capacity to manage his own finances. Had Kiddo lacked the mental capacity to manage his own finances, a decision would have needed to be made for him in his 'best interests', taking into account his own views and the opinions of other people, such as health or social care professionals.

8.169. Financial capacity is not explicitly defined by law and therefore it must be considered within the context of broader mental capacity assessments. These are governed by the Mental Capacity Act 2005⁷² which states that individuals have to be presumed to have capacity unless proved otherwise.

8.170. Therefore, considering the capacity of Kiddo, rightly involved professionals asking themselves whether there was any reason to doubt capacity in the first instance, and professionals working with Kiddo all concluded that no mental capacity assessment had ever been necessary because there hadn't ever been any valid concerns that Kiddo might not be able to make financial decisions for himself.

8.171. However it is worth highlighting that in 2018 a local government ombudsman found that a council's failure to assess a man's ability to make decisions about his accounts after his daughter had raised safeguarding referrals, had left him at risk of 'possible financial abuse'⁷³.

8.172. This examples how crucial assessment of financial decision-making capacity is in suspected cases of financial exploitation. And given that there is evidence (by means of reports to the police and safeguarding concerns) of professionals being concerned for Kiddo's ability to protect and manage his finances, and to understand and appreciate the consequence of his financial decisions, there is an argument that full capacity assessments with regard to finances should have been undertaken and documented.

8.173. But whether a full capacity assessment was undertaken or not, given the safeguarding concerns there are other support options that could have been considered. Such as:

- One to one discussion with Kiddo in relation to how to safely manage his finances.
- Identification of Barbara and bringing her to the attention of relevant agencies, professionals, and others with an interest in Kiddo's welfare.
- Discussion with Kiddo to ensure that Kiddo knew that there were support options such as the use of a harassment order.
- Discussion with Kiddo to consider what could decrease his isolation and/or dependence upon Barbara for company.

8.174. Importantly professionals needed to explore Kiddo's understanding of exploitation and financial abuse. Previous lived experiences can sometimes not only heighten the risk of becoming victim to exploitation but also reduce an individual's understanding of the situation. These lived experiences can include prior experience of neglect or abuse, mental health issues, social difficulties, a history of being in care...

⁷² The Mental Capacity Act 2005 provides the legal framework for supporting people aged 16 and over to make decisions.

⁷³ [Failure to conduct mental capacity assessment left man at risk of financial abuse, ombudsman says - Community Care](#)

8.175. Even though Kiddo served 12 years in the British Army there is nothing documented to evidence professional consideration of trauma. However this review does recognise that because Kiddo was not deemed to have care and support needs, no professional was working with him closely enough to build a trusting relationship in which trauma could be explored.

8.176. Upon her next release from prison, Barbara returned to Kiddo's property. Many agencies were aware of this, but focus remained on Barbara and the resoluteness of her decision. At this time, though there was a clear concern for Kiddo, there appears to have been an acceptance that he was in agreement to the arrangements and 'consenting' to Barbara taking his money and living in his property

8.177. Healthcare records evidence a steady decline in Kiddo's weight hereafter and healthcare professionals started to struggle to engage him in support as effectively as they had previously been able to do so. For example, Kiddo stopped responding to telephone calls from the Social Prescribing Team and he stopped arranging his podiatry appointments.

8.178. Within months Kiddo was exhibiting several of the named indicators of abuse as outlined in the Nottingham City Multi-Agency Safeguarding Adults at Risk Guidance, namely

- changes in living conditions,
- a lack of food,
- a sudden inability to pay bills or maintain lifestyle, and
- unusual or inappropriate bank activity.

All of which indicated that Kiddo was experiencing a deterioration to his well-being – and the reason needed to be explored.

8.179. Given the presence of the above indicators a safeguarding concern could have been submitted in line with safeguarding adult procedures. Analysis of why this wasn't done suggests that it was because no agency had the full picture of Kiddo's lived experiences. Agencies worked in siloes to address concerns without sufficient curiosity into the holistic reasoning behind the changes. The response to Recommendation 1 will support professionals to explore and understand an individual's full circumstances in the future.

8.180. Had a safeguarding concern been submitted, enquiries may have linked Kiddo's declining health to the previous reported abuse and/or Barbara's recent release from prison.

8.181. In May 2023, Kiddo courageously reported his situation to the police. He informed the Officers that for the past three years, Barbara had been visiting his flat once or twice a week and staying over. During these visits, she would assist with household chores before demanding money from him, typically ranging from £20 to £50. Kiddo explained that he had previously assured the police that everything was fine because he was concerned about potential future actions by Barbara. Kiddo reported that he was now experiencing financial difficulties, and he additionally disclosed that approximately six months ago, Barbara had hit him, although no injury was sustained. He also mentioned that Barbara had caused damage to his radio.

8.182. In the first instance Kiddo declined the offer of an Officer attending his flat and removing Barbara immediately, stating that it was *all or nothing* as he didn't want her *kicking off*. However the following day, Kiddo re-attended the police station stating that he did want Barbara removing as she had demanded more money. An Officer attended and Barbara packed her belongings and left. Kiddo consented to a Public Protection Notice being shared and this was processed through to the Adult Safeguarding Team and shared with Adult Social Care two days later.

8.183. This must have been a scary time for Kiddo; having bravely reached out to the police for support, Barbara had subsequently been removed - but this had been done before on numerous occasions and Barbara had always come back.

8.184. In domestic abuse situations, post-separation equates an escalation of abuse, with survivors reporting continued threats and intimidation and being at higher risk. This risk is reflective in Kiddo's situation with Barbara, and this would have been a good time for the police to discuss with Kiddo whether he felt safe and to potentially ask his permission to contact his family members to discuss additional support.

8.185. In relation to Barbara, there were no enforcement opportunities as she was no longer subject to Probation Services, but Kiddo had disclosed assault and criminal damage. Consideration could have been had of arresting Barbara which would have afforded Kiddo some time to address his personal safety.

8.186. In addition, the Neighbourhood Policing Team Officers could have been asked to conduct frequent reassurance visits to Kiddo's address and to patrol the local area in order to deter Barbara away from the property. And consideration could have been given to informal preventative measures to deter Barbara from the address – for example, the landlord could have been asked to increase their visits to the address and/or asked to issue an Acceptable Behaviour Contract prohibiting visitors.

8.187. Other interventions that could have been considered include Criminal Behaviour Orders, Injunctions or Community Protection Notices requiring Barbara to stay away from Kiddo.

8.188. In response to the Police Public Protection Notice, an Adult Safeguarding Social Worker attempted to call Kiddo, but neither phone numbers provided were recognised. It was positive practice that the Social Worker contacted the Police Officer to request an update of the situation and that unable to obtain any different telephone numbers, thereafter, visited Kiddo's address.

8.189. Barbara answered the door stating that Kiddo was visiting his sister, and she was at his flat to clean. The Social Worker gained entry to the address (which it is reported was clean - though it smelled of unknown substances) and later updated the police of the visit by email. Four days later the Social Worker further visited the address. Barbara answered again stating that Kiddo was still at his sister's. The Social Worker once more updated the police by email and evidenced her concerns when she said *I feel as though he [Kiddo] should be treated as a missing person but of course, that's your decision.*

8.190. This review would like to highlight that the Social Worker was tenacious in their approach, attempting home visits and gaining entrance to the property in an attempt to identify if Kiddo was there rather than accepting what Barbara said at face value⁷⁴. Additionally the Social Worker relayed Barbara's comments/explanations to the police on multiple occasions and requested that Kiddo be reported as a missing person. Furthermore, the Social Worker was pro-active in contacting the GP Practice and attempting to track Kiddo's movements: identifying when his medication was last collected at the pharmacy (when he was last seen) and even contacting the hospital in attempt to identify if he had been admitted and was receiving hospital treatment. Over all the Social Worker demonstrated excellent collaborative working with the police and agency services in sharing information.

8.191. Sadly the following day Kiddo's body was found by the police.

The Professional Challenges

⁷⁴ Though in the absence of information regarding Barbara's offending behaviour being shared or known by the Local Authority, the social worker entered the property without the knowledge of SH's previous offending behaviour with SH at the house. This placed the social worker at risk.

8.192. The previous two sections of this report analyse the professional practice around Barbara and Kiddo separately. However, in order to identify learning for future practice, this review must consider why the practice around the two individuals didn't ever effectively come together and the crucial question for the learning of this review is why didn't professionals recognise the potential risks and effect a multi-agency response to Barbara's exploitation of Kiddo which led to his murder?

The Professional Training Offer

8.193. An initial challenge for professionals started with the fact that financial abuse and exploitation are multifaceted areas of work for all agencies.

8.194. Neither financial abuse nor exploitation is a specific criminal offence. The police and Crown Prosecution Service are only able to consider offences on a case-by-case basis and must consider the different legislation within the criminal conduct undertaken by the perpetrator.

8.195. Where criminal thresholds have not been met, there still remains a legal duty under section 42 of the Care Act 2014, to make enquiries about the safeguarding concerns - if the individual, has needs for care and support, is at risk of 'abuse'⁷⁵ and, because of their care and support needs, is unable to protect himself from the risk of abuse. But Kiddo did not initially meet this criteria and any early support therefore needed to be offered by means of other referrals and services.

8.196. This complexity examples why it is important to ensure that all agencies include financial abuse and exploitation within their training and as directed at Recommendation 6, embed the Slavery Exploitation Team support offer.

8.197. This review has explored agencies current training offers in relation to financial abuse and exploitation. Summaries of their offers can be found at [Appendix 2](#).

Lack of Processes.

8.198. Another challenge professionals faced in relation to supporting Kiddo was that having allowed Barbara access to his property and having agreed to give her the money, Kiddo was seen as being somewhat 'complicit', and this led to missed opportunities to identify his vulnerabilities and needs. Additionally, Kiddo, like most victims, was reluctant to disclose his situation to professionals due to fear of repercussions. And furthermore the intricacy of the offender/victim relationship was not always understood by professionals.

8.199. All of this reflects historic practice attitudes to domestic abuse; it is only in the last 30 years or so, that there has been a change in how domestic abuse is understood and treated.

8.200. Clearly professional practice around exploitation needs to follow similar guidelines to those outlined for domestic abuse because had Kiddo and Barbara been 'associated persons' as per the Domestic Abuse Act,

- Kiddo would have been told relevant details in relation to Barbara's criminal history
- The range of available protection orders would have been discussed with him
- Markers would have been placed against both Kiddo's and Barbara's casefiles to highlight the situation
- A victimless prosecution would have been considered.
- Professionals would have been trained to consider Kiddo's fear and would have better understood how this could affect his ability to disclose and engage with support.

⁷⁵ Section 42(3) of the Care Act 2014 defines abuse as including financial abuse.

8.201. To adopt similar practice in relation to exploitation in the first instance, professionals need to ensure that those who are vulnerable to exploitation - for example, older people, people with learning disabilities or learning difficulties and people with mental health needs, have an understanding and awareness of the indicators of exploitation.

8.202. Thereafter, known perpetrators of exploitation must be flagged, and their relevant information must be shared multi-agency (to help protect the vulnerable in their area) and disclosed as appropriate to their victims.

8.203. When concerns regarding exploitation arise, there must be a co-ordinated response involving multiple agencies—such as police, the Slavery Exploitation Team, Probation Services, Social Care, Local Authorities, Housing, health workers, substance abuse support agencies, and the voluntary sector. And in order to respond effectively, professionals must be afforded a comprehensive understanding of the legislative options available to them, as well as the tools and powers that can be employed to disrupt exploitation effectively.

8.204. Additionally, whilst it is important to recognise that perpetrators of exploitation may have their own support needs, such as mental health issues or substance misuse and that agencies should consider whether providing support or assessment to these individuals might help mitigate risks, this offer must never compromise the protection of the community.

Learning 14: The challenges for professionals began with the complexity of exploitation work and lack of direct processes.

Recommendation 7: Nottingham Community Safety Partnership in collaboration with partner agencies must learn from domestic abuse practice to develop and promote a robust straightforward multi-agency resource (which should include referral to the Slavery Exploitation Team and reference the work they do) which will support professionals from all agencies to respond to concerns of financial abuse and exploitation effectively. This resource must thereafter be integrated into agency safeguarding training and processes.

Recommendation 8: The Home Office should consider reviewing and developing exploitation practice based upon the good practice standards exemplified within domestic abuse.

9. Positive Practice

9.1. Professional discussion during this review has highlighted many examples of positive practice⁷⁶ from professionals involved. Examples are included within the body of the report and include,

- the Social Worker's tenacious approach
- Clean Slate's communications with Probation Services
- Adult Social Care's referral to the Slavery Exploitation Team
- the pharmacist's referral to the Social Prescribing Team
- the Women's Centre referral to the housing authority – the Women's Centre is not a statutory organisation and consequently was not duty bound to make the referral.

10. Conclusions

⁷⁶ Positive practice in this report includes both expected practice and what is done beyond what is expected.

10.1. Barbara was a complex individual who struggled with substance addiction from an early age. Her dependency on drugs significantly impacted her life, and she was convicted of criminal offences relating to violent acts which she committed to obtain funds for her addiction. Unfortunately, this included targeting vulnerable individuals. She was twice imprisoned for violent assaults on her elderly grandfather.

10.2. Barbara's significant need for substances, and its impact on her life, resulted in her receiving extensive support from local agencies. However, she manipulated the system to reside in locations of her choice, and this situation was not adequately addressed by the Probation Service.

10.3. When back in the community, Barbara funded her addiction with survival sex work and in time through befriending Kiddo. Barbara steadily exploited Kiddo to give her his life savings and there is also evidence she assaulted him.

10.4. Sadly, Barbara's pattern of exploitative behaviour was not properly identified by agencies. There was a lack of professional curiosity demonstrated, and no single agency identified Kiddo's lived experience. Notably there were no multi-agency professionals' meetings held in the scoping period. Consequently despite opportunities, Barbara's coercion of Kiddo was not interrupted.

10.5. Upon her release from prison, police were notified of Barbara's release via the standard notification of release form for anyone subject to licence, however this notification would not have specified that Barbara was a Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements Category 2 Level 1 Violent Offender. And this impacted police responses and information sharing when Kiddo, Kiddo's bank and Kiddo's family reported incidents/concerns. The information should have been shared on VISOR, a multi-agency intelligence system but was not.

10.6. The police referred Kiddo to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub, but he was initially identified as not having eligible Care Act needs, and the criteria for a safeguarding enquiry was not deemed met (though he was referred to the Slavery Exploitation Team on one occasion).

10.7. Furthermore, Kiddo was not identified either by the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub or the police as a repeat vulnerable adult. This resulted in each report being managed as if it were the first.

10.8. Consequently, when Kiddo went to the police station just days before his homicide, financially distressed and unsure how to remove Barbara from his home, his previous reports were not taken into account. His current report of theft and criminal damage was managed in isolation, and there was no consideration given to arresting Barbara – though a police Public Protection Notice was referred to Adult Social Care.

10.9. The risk of harm Barbara presented from her historical offending behaviour was mostly overlooked and though there is evidence of professional concern, Kiddo was never identified as being at direct risk of harm from Barbara. This was due to a lack of professional curiosity to establish who Barbara was living with.

10.10. In addition, because there was no intimate relationship, when exploitation was identified the incidents did not meet the criteria to be managed as 'domestic abuse'. Therefore, although Barbara's offending behaviour and risk mirrored domestic abuse by way of coercive and controlling behaviour, financial abuse and ultimately homicide, domestic abuse processes could not be followed. This resulted in less robust protections, and it is evident that agency procedures for exploitation need to change and mirror those used in domestic abuse.

10.11. Overall, agencies worked mainly in silo, each managing different aspects and holding their own information without collaboration to assess the entire situation. Thus Barbara was able to continue her activities in support of her drug addiction without challenge.

10.12. Kiddo was failed by agencies and could, and should, have been protected. Instead, he was violently murdered by Barbara; a convicted high-risk abuser whose risks to Kiddo should have been identified.

10.13. Unless the recommendations of this review are implemented, the same outcome will be possible for future victims of exploitation in Kiddo's situation.

11. Lessons to be Learnt and Recommendations

11.1. Nottingham Community Safety Partnership, the Independent Chair and the Independent Reviewer would like to thank agencies for their single agency lessons learned from this Domestic Homicide Review which were outlined within their reports and are detailed at Appendix 3 of this report.

11.2. The review would ask that all the agencies/organisations provide assurance to Nottingham Community Safety Partnership of their action plans being monitored and outcomes being impact assessed.

11.3. The multi-agency lessons learned from this Domestic Homicide Review are highlighted in bold text throughout this report, but for reference, are repeated here alongside the relevant question if the learning has not been already addressed:

	Lessons/Learning	Has this learning been addressed?		Recommendation (where required)
1	The Female Offender Strategy influenced probation professionals to prioritise providing support to Barbara in addressing her problems within the community rather than utilising enforcement action.	This review has been assured that this influence would not happen now as professionals have developed a better understanding of how to balance the offer of support services against risk to the community.		
2	The Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements were not effectively reviewed which resulted in a lack of consideration as to whether Barbara's case management would have benefitted from Level 2 arrangements.	This review has been assured that this learning is now addressed as alongside the improvements to Probation Services practice (identified in paragraph 8.7), the police have already recognised a training need in relation to Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements and have commenced developments.		
3	A lack of professional curiosity regarding the 'elderly bloke' Barbara said she had befriended, equated to a missed opportunity to explore any potential vulnerability and identify risk.	Professional curiosity is addressed at Recommendation 4		
4	Agencies focussed upon their own remit within Barbara's		1	Nottingham Community Safety Partnership should seek to review

	rehabilitation and in working predominantly in siloes, lost sight of the risk she posed to the community if rehabilitation wasn't proving successful.			and re-issue guidance on all multi-agency meetings to support practitioners' to recognise a legitimate reason for getting together and to empower them to lead and convene professionals' meetings and/or refer to another meeting forum, as appropriate. Nottingham Community Safety Partnership must work with agencies to ensure that the information is thereafter known, and easily accessible, to all professionals.
5	There is an identified need for establishing a communication pathway between Probation Services and the police for sharing information concerning violent offenders and domestic abuse perpetrators.	This review has been informed that as a result of this review the police multi-agency information team has already started to work with Probation Services to improve their information sharing systems	2	Nottingham Community Safety Partnership in collaboration with Nottingham Safeguarding Adults Board, must gain assurance and understanding of the continuing work between Probation Services and the police in relation to improving their communication and information sharing processes, and seek evidence of improvement.
6	A rehabilitative focus on Barbara lost sight of the risks she posed to others.	In regard to overlooking risks when Barbara was subject to licence conditions; the review heard that it was the influence of the Female Offender Strategy which led probation professionals to prioritise supporting Barbara within the community rather than enforce penalties. This would not occur now as professionals have a better understanding of how to balance support services with community risk. And when Barbara was under Post Sentence Supervision, it was the influence of the Pilot scheme which led to probation professionals adopting a more passive approach towards enforcement and the review has been assured that the new probation reset guidance aims for a more balanced approach.		
7	When a new Probation Officer is allocated a case, there should be a thorough documented handover to reflect what has been discussed.	Probation Services have informed that in relation to cases being allocated; under current standard practice the allocation would now be clearly outlined, and it would be recorded on the system that before the case can be moved, a full		

		handover is required and must be documented.		
8	Further risk assessment and professional enquiry was required to gather the knowable information and to support better identification of the risk of exploitation.	The safeguarding check was only the starting point of the enquiry. Improved and continuous professional curiosity would have seen further information being sought and triangulated from other sources. Professional curiosity is addressed at Recommendation 4		
9	Loneliness is a widespread experience; however, when it becomes prolonged and persistent, it can significantly impact an individual's health and heighten their susceptibility to exploitation.		3	Nottingham Community Safety Partnership must seek assurance from agencies that loneliness is acknowledged as a feature of safeguarding within their guidance and training packages
10	Professionals needed to be 'curious' by asking questions and thereafter verifying information from alternative sources, as required to gain an effective understanding of the circumstances.		4	Agencies must evidence to Nottingham Community Safety Partnership that that they are prompting and encouraging their professionals to be professionally curious, and Nottingham Community Safety Partnership must gain an improved understanding of how to support agencies with this practice.
11	Many professionals remain unaware of the Slavery Exploitation Team.		5	Nottingham Community safety Partnership in collaboration with the Slavery Exploitation Team must raise awareness of the Slavery Exploitation Team within partner agencies and support agencies to embed referrals into their guidance and processes.
12	Marking Kiddo's address as a Place of Interest might have prompted a stronger response to later incidents.		6	Nottingham Police must review the criteria and use of their Place of Interest Markers in relation to repeat victims of crime and ensure that the updated criteria is implemented across the force and incorporated into training.
13	Valuable learning from the identification and protection of domestic abuse victims is not replicated in exploitation safeguarding processes which is allowing exploitation victims to remain unsupported and at risk.	This learning must be respected within the action plan in relation to Recommendation 7 later in this report.		
14	The challenges for professionals began with the complexity of exploitation		7	Nottingham Community Safety Partnership in collaboration with partner agencies must learn from domestic abuse practice to

	work and lack of direct processes.		<p>develop and promote a robust straightforward multi-agency resource (which should include referral to the Slavery Exploitation Team and reference the work they do) which will support professionals from all agencies to respond to concerns of financial abuse and exploitation effectively. This resource must thereafter be integrated into agency safeguarding training and processes.</p> <p>8 The Home Office should consider reviewing and developing exploitation practice based upon the good practice standards exemplified within domestic abuse.</p>
--	------------------------------------	--	---

Appendix 1 - The Independent Office for Police Conduct investigation Identifications

- Once a Public Protection Notice is completed and sent to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub team the reviewing officer appears to deal with the Public Protection Notice in isolation and there does not seem to be a consideration for reviewing information provided in previous Public Protection Notices for individuals referred. Nottinghamshire Police should consider implementing a process where the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub team review existing Public Protection Notices to look for patterns of behaviour relating to an individual and the timings of the incidents if they involve the same person in order to assist them in making a decision to refer an incident to the local authority.
- There is also a lack of information sharing once the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub team send a referral to the local authority. Feedback on referrals could assist with forming intelligence around an individual's situation.

Appendix 2 - Agencies current training offers

- **Nottinghamshire Police** has informed this review that financial abuse and exploitation is covered in their initial officer training – mostly within their public protection training but in varying contexts. For example, their 'Adults at Risk' session specifically references financial abuse as a type of abuse and the example Public Protection Notice that is used is a (sanitised) real life case of financial abuse with the abuser being a family member. The police training also covers financial abuse in the domestic abuse context as being one of the many ways that domestic abuse can occur, and there is specific reference to controlling and coercive behaviour. Additionally the police have a specific input from the fraud team to cover fraud offences, and this also links to financial abuse/exploitation, referencing calls for services/banking protocol, vulnerability of victims etcetera. Furthermore around a year after their initial training, Officers return for a further two weeks of training (referred to as 'Phase 4'), amongst which is a full day of Domestic Abuse Matters - where again, financial abuse is identified and discussed in the domestic abuse/coercive and controlling behaviour context. The Officers also get an input from Cyber fraud team who talk about the risks and management of cybercrime, particularly fraud and this links into issues of online financial abuse/exploitation. Divisional training days are also held so that every response and neighbourhood Officer attends three times a year for additional Continuing Professional Development and training. In 2021, Domestic Abuse – Impact training was delivered (reference to financial abuse in a domestic abuse setting again).

- **Nottinghamshire HealthCare Trust:**

Financial abuse is covered in both our Level 1 and Level 3 training (face-face) as follows:

Level 1:

- 'Types of Abuse' slide - identifies all ten categories of abuse. A video is then played which provides an example of financial abuse.
- Domestic Abuse slide – we briefly discuss individuals being frequently absent, or persistently being late to work, or being harassed at work by their partner being an indicator of domestic abuse (in the form of economic abuse)

Level 3:

- Types of abuse scenario-based activity. Financial Lasting Powers of Attorney being abused is the scenario given that relates to financial abuse.
- The definition of economic abuse is discussed within the context of domestic abuse in more detail i.e. we include not allowing someone to be economically independent in their relationship, perpetrator having sole control of the household income or providing the survivor with an allowance from their own earnings, not allowing a person to work, or making life at work very difficult so they leave or lose their job. We also provide a couple of examples of a student being prevented from finishing their degree, and the Hart family (DHR from Lincoln) as an example of how economic abuse can be used to coerce and control in a less obvious sense i.e. controlling the heating/lighting in the home, not allowing access to a phone or transport.
- Lasting Powers of Attorney is discussed as part of the section on Mental Capacity Act, with an example of relatives abusing a patients' finances whilst they are in hospital.
- The case study activity also involves financial abuse of an older adult with care and support needs living in a household where domestic abuse is a feature (this is only included within induction)

And in our E-Learning as follows:

Level 1: definitions for financial abuse and economic abuse (in the context of domestic abuse)

Level 3: definitions as above and a scenario-based activity to identify which type of abuse is indicated in each scenario which includes financial abuse.

Domestic Abuse: economic abuse is also discussed more specifically in our new domestic abuse E-Learning; however this is not mandatory.

Exploitation is covered face-face in:

Level 1:

- Types of abuse slide includes a definition of Modern Slavery, within which we include the practices of County Lines and Cuckooing.
- Adult grooming is discussed when discussing vulnerable groups, under the heading of social disadvantage, isolation and exclusion.
- Grooming processes and exploitation of both children and adults is discussed under the heading 'Online influences and abuse'

Level 3:

- Adult grooming and exploitation of adults are discussed under the heading of 'Adults at Risk', in the context of adults with mental health needs, substance misuse, learning disability, social isolation and exclusion often being targeted by criminal gangs for the purpose of drug dealing and cuckooing.
- Learning from reviews – the case of Stephen Hoskin is discussed which was a case of cuckooing, and the lessons learned from this case in terms are discussed at length.
- Cuckooing is often used as an example when discussing Making Safeguarding Personal

- Prevent is discussed briefly but focusing on vulnerable adults being exploited and drawn into terrorism.

And in E-Learning:

Level 1 - Sexual exploitation is included in the definition of Modern Slavery.

Level 3 - Sexual and criminal exploitation are expanded upon under the heading of Modern Slavery in the context of adult safeguarding.

- **Jericho Road Project** – have informed that
 - all staff (including those not involved in delivering support to service users) complete Safeguarding of vulnerable adults' level 2 and Safeguarding children level 2 through CPD online as part of their staff induction and repeat the training every 2 years.
 - All staff involved in regularly supporting service users or managing those who do, have attended Equation training on domestic abuse, most notably sessions such as Understanding and Responding to Domestic Abuse and Improving support for survivors of domestic abuse training.
 - In February 2024 the Nottingham City Slavery and Exploitation team ran a training session on their work for Jericho Road Project staff team.
- **Probation Services** informed that there is currently no specific training delivered in relation to Financial Abuse and Exploitation though the current mandatory domestic abuse and safeguarding training does have sections referencing these issues. However their partnership work with the Slavery and Exploitation Team should lead to the development and delivery of briefings covering these issues by the end of 2025.
- **Nottingham Recovery Network** informed that the training offered to them recognises the signs and symptoms of abuse/neglect as defined in The Care and Support statutory guidance for the Care Act (2014) abuse can include but is not limited to:
 - Financial or material abuse, (e.g. stealing, selling assets, controlling finances, exploitation.)
 - Modern day slavery & human trafficking; (e.g. forced labour and domestic servitude)
 - Responding to people who have experienced or are experiencing abuse Nottingham Recovery Network recognises that all staff have a duty to act on reports, or suspicions of abuse or neglect. This may be a discussion with colleague, line manager or safeguarding lead in the first instance and then acting on the advice given. Follow up with a referral to appropriate referral to support agencies such as Adult's social care, Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference, Slavery Exploitation Risk Assessment Conference.

Appendix 3 – Single Agency Recommendations

Probation Services:

Recommendation	Detailed actions	Person responsible	Timescales	Desired Outcome	Audit
Probation Instruction 30/2014: Drug appointment and drug testing for licence conditions and post sentence supervision requirements to be re-issued to all staff.	The Probation Instruction will be recirculated via email to all staff. The lead Senior Probation Officer for substance misuse will attend all local team meetings to address key points and answer any staff queries. A sample of 20 cases with licence conditions relating to drug testing will be reviewed to ensure that testing and enforcement actions is in line with policy expectations.	Deputy Head of Service and Lead Substance Misuse Senior Probation Officer	Email to be circulated within 4 weeks. Follow up meetings to be attended within 8 weeks. Case sampling to take place 3 months after the initial activities have been implemented.	Ensure all staff are appraised of expectations around drug testing and that policy and guidance is being followed consistently	
A review to be undertaken to ensure that case allocation practices have been embedded, and that Senior Probation Officers have processes in place to review new allocations with Probation Practitioners	A sample of 3 cases per Sentence Management Senior Probation Officer allocated within the last 3 months will be reviewed to ensure that case allocation has followed guidance and that all new allocations have had a follow up case discussion. If the evidence indicates that practice has not been embedded, then further input will be delivered to the staffing group or individuals as required.	Deputy Head of Service	6 months	To confirm that process is fully embedded within practice	
A review to be undertaken to ensure that the Address Checks policy has been fully embedded	A sample of 20 licence cases across the Probation Delivery Unit will be reviewed to ensure that pre-release address checks	Deputy Head of Service	6 months	To confirm that process is fully embedded within practice	

within Probation practice	have been appropriately completed, and checks have been completed in full ahead of any proposed address change. If the evidence indicates that practice has not been embedded, then further input will be delivered to the staffing group or individuals as required.				
Additional training to be provided to all staff around Professional Curiosity	Senior Probation Officers to re-deliver the Professional Curiosity 7 Minute briefing to all staff in a team meeting and reissue the document	Deputy Head of Service	6 months	To provide assurance that all staff have received relevant training and are aware of the importance of exercising professional curiosity in their roles	
To undertake a review in relation to case handover processes to ensure that processes are being followed	A sample of 20 cases will be reviewed across the Probation Delivery Unit to ensure that when management of a case is moved that a fully documented case handover takes place between the incoming and outgoing practitioner and that there is appropriate management oversight of the decision	Deputy Head of Service	6 months	To confirm that process is fully embedded within practice	

POW Nottingham

Recommendation	Detailed actions	Person responsible	Timescales	Desired Outcome	Audit
Improve information sharing procedures with external agencies	Bring to Sex Worker Meetings to discuss procedure/protocol	Police Liaison Worker	TBC	Detailed review of those released from prison/returning to the area within meeting.	Minutes of Sex Worker Meetings
Improve information sharing procedures internally	Briefing in team meeting of the information gathered	Police Liaison Worker	January 2025	Increased awareness of arising issues and concerns	Minutes of team meeting

	from Sex Worker Meetings				
Train/encourage staff to show professional curiosity	Training session to staff to understand what is professional curiosity and the importance of it	Management	March 2025	More detailed understanding of the lives of the people we work with	More detailed information and notes

Equation

Recommendation	Detailed actions	Person responsible	Timescales	Desired Outcome	Audit
Agencies to access 'Working with Men experiencing DVA' training	Circulate training details	Head of Service, Equation	By April 2025 when 2025/26 training dates are available	<p>Learning outcomes for professionals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the experience of men living with domestic violence and abuse in their intimate and family relationships • Develop skills in responding appropriately to men experiencing domestic abuse • Recognise the complexities of working with men experiencing domestic abuse • Understand how to use relevant tools to respond appropriately to men experiencing abuse, including risk assessment and screening tools and referral pathways • Recognise good practice points for responding to gay, bisexual and transgender men 	
Agencies to attend 'Recognising and Responding to Perpetrators of Domestic Abuse' training	Circulate training details	Head of Service, Equation	By April 2025 when 2025/26 training dates are available	<p>Learning outcomes for professionals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build a safe alliance with a perpetrator of abuse, effectively building sufficient rapport to gain information crucial for possible behavioural change intervention - Use Equation's counter allegations tool to get closer to identifying a primary perpetrator - Use Equation's Perpetrator Assessment Tool to explore abusive 	

				behaviours with perpetrators in a therapeutic manner - Explore possible underlying issues related to domestic abuse - Identify risk factors when working with perpetrators and have knowledge of safer practice - Identify possible indicators of positive change in perpetrators of abuse - Complete an in depth referral to a voluntary Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programme (DVPP).	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust

Recommendation	Detailed actions	Person responsible	Timescales	Desired Outcome	Audit
Routine enquiry to be added to the templates used for podiatry documentation	Review templates used on Sys 1 to ensure it makes documentation regarding routine enquiry clearer	Manager for Podiatry		Routine enquiry is embedded within the service and recorded appropriately	

Nottingham Women's Centre

Recommendation	Detailed actions	Person responsible	Timescales	Desired Outcome	Audit
Amend case review proforma	As well as assessing and monitoring arising risk, include routine review of original risk assessment from referral to take into account changes in circumstances -during support plan reviews with case workers	Sara Garton	January 2025	Line managers routinely check on risk factors, are more able to mitigate risk and ensure professional curiosity in all caseworkers.	April 2025
Training for casework team - Multi Agency Working	Train caseworkers at induction and in training sessions – ensuring knowledge of importance and application of multi-agency working	Sara Garton	March	All caseworkers are able to appropriately convene multi-disciplinary meetings, information share and minimise risk of missed information/action taken	June 2025

Training - women perpetrators domestic abuse	Source training for caseworkers awareness	Sara Garton	February 2025	Caseworkers awareness is raised, bias is addressed, risk correctly identified.	May 2025
--	---	-------------	---------------	--	----------

Nottinghamshire Police

Recommendation 1

It is recommended that Nottinghamshire Police identify the best process to ensure that officers attending incidents where vulnerability is identified are aware of their responsibility to consider and implement safeguarding measures. This is in addition to any support provided following the submission of a Public Protection Notice.

Recommendation 2 from the Independent Office for Police Conduct report.

'If the initial decision by the reviewing officer is not to share a Public Protection Notice with Social Care, then the reviewing officer will review the last 3 months previous Public Protection Notice's linked to that nominal on Niche to ensure that there is no relevant further information or repeat concerns that may influence that decision. When we document the decision on Niche not to send a Public Protection Notice to social care, we include the statement 'I have reviewed the last 3 months Public Protection Notice's linked to this nominal and there is no relevant information that influences this decision'.

Recommendation 3 From Independent Office for Police Conduct Comments.

Nottinghamshire Police to consult with Social Care to consider how to improve information sharing around the outcome of any safeguarding interventions adopted following referrals by the MASH team to the local authority.

Recommendation 4

Attending officers and supervisors should be reminded to identify Repeat Vulnerable Victims using information available within Force systems. The qualifier facilities available within Niche should be populated so that such individuals can be readily identified and safeguarding interventions considered.

The use of such qualifiers would assist in identifying repeat vulnerable victims for any subsequent tasking process as identified within Recommendation 5.

Recommendation 5

Nottinghamshire Police to consider implementing a formal tasking process to identify repeat vulnerable victims identified as Adults at Risk and identify the most appropriate resource to provide safeguarding interventions.

Recommendation 6

Nottinghamshire Police to consider amending the Adult at Risk Public Protection Notification Report (Public Protection Notice) on Niche; to include questions to remind the submitting officer of their responsibilities around safeguarding, and to identify if the individual is a repeat vulnerable victim.

CONFIDENTIAL

DHR Haiku Report Recommendations and IMR Action Plan April 2025

This action plan is a live document and subject to change as outcomes are delivered.

DHR Haiku Report Recommendations:

	Recommendation	Rationale	Scope of Recommendation - Local or National	Action to Take	Lead Agency	Target Date	Date of Completion	Evidence: • Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation • Outcome Have there been key steps that have allowed the recommendation to be enacted? List the evidence for outcomes being achieved What does outcome look like? What is the overall change or improvement to be achieved by this recommendation?	RAG
1)	Nottingham Community Safety Partnership should seek to review and re-issue guidance on all multi-agency meetings to support practitioners' to recognise a legitimate reason for getting together and to empower them to lead and convene professionals' meetings and/or refer to another meeting forum, as appropriate. Nottingham Community Safety Partnership must work with agencies to ensure that the information is thereafter known, and easily accessible, to all professionals.	Agencies focussed upon their own remit within Barbara's rehabilitation and in working predominantly in siloes, lost sight of the risk she posed to the community if rehabilitation wasn't proving successful.	Local	<p>Prepare a One-Slide Briefing for ALIG Dissemination.</p> <p>Create a concise briefing to be shared via ALIG and cascaded to partner agencies. This briefing should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference relevant existing frameworks and policies. • Provide clear guidance on when and how to convene multi-agency meetings. • Outline who the appropriate and relevant partners are to involve. 	<p>Input required by ALL Assurance, Learning and Implementation Group partners to capture information required.</p> <p>NCSP and Equation to create the one-slide briefing document.</p>	Sept 2025		All agencies passing this information out will demonstrate completion.	

	Recommendation	Rationale	Scope of Recommendation - Local or National	Action to Take	Lead Agency	Target Date	Date of Completion	Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation • Outcome <p>Have there been key steps that have allowed the recommendation to be enacted?</p> <p>List the evidence for outcomes being achieved What does outcome look like?</p> <p>What is the overall change or improvement to be achieved by this recommendation?</p>	RAG
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize that this applies not only to established meetings and pathways, but also to ad hoc multi-agency meetings convened for specific cases. <p>All partners have a responsibility to initiate a multi-agency professionals meeting whenever a case requires collaborative discussion.</p>					
2)	Nottingham Community Safety Partnership in collaboration with Nottingham Safeguarding Adults Board, must gain assurance and understanding of the continuing work between Probation Services and the police in relation to improving their communication and information sharing processes, and seek evidence of improvement.	There is an identified need for establishing a communication pathway between Probation Services and the police for sharing information concerning violent offenders and domestic abuse perpetrators.	Local	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Police and Probation will work together to facilitate improved working with CAT 2/3 MAPPA nominals by creating a new CAT2/3 Police team and ensuring that all MAPPA nominals are on Visor and Probation staff vetted and trained to access the system 2. Police and Probation will work to ensure that all PPNs are shared directly from the Police to Probation on the next working day to ensure a timely exchange of domestic abuse information 3. Police and Probation will review the wider information sharing protocol to improve the request for and nature of 	Probation Nottinghamshire Police	May 2026		<p>14/08/2025</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The formation of the new MAPPA Cat 2/3 is almost at completion – the recruitment for this team sits with the Police and I understand this process in now at the onboarding stage. <p>Probation continue their program of vetting and training staff on Visor and nominals are being added to the system regularly to ensure that information can be shared via this route.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Significant progress has been made in the area of sharing all PPNs directly from the Police to Probation. This action is awaiting final information assurance and final operational detail before rolling out. 3. Discussions have commenced in relation to wider information sharing between both agencies outside of the areas above – this is a longer and more complex piece of work which will build upon the systems and work already being undertaken between both agencies. 	

	Recommendation	Rationale	Scope of Recommendation - Local or National	Action to Take	Lead Agency	Target Date	Date of Completion	Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation • Outcome Have there been key steps that have allowed the recommendation to be enacted? List the evidence for outcomes being achieved What does outcome look like? What is the overall change or improvement to be achieved by this recommendation?	RAG
				information sharing between agencies					
3)	<p>Nottingham Community Safety Partnership must seek assurance from agencies that loneliness is acknowledged as a feature of safeguarding within their guidance and training packages.</p>	<p>Loneliness is a widespread experience; however, when it becomes prolonged and persistent, it can significantly impact an individual's health and heighten their susceptibility to exploitation.</p>	Local	<p>Integration of Learning from Recommendation 1.</p> <p>The initial briefing developed under Recommendation 1 will include this learning, presented within the same slide.</p> <p>Partner agencies are encouraged to embed this information into their future training packages and internal briefings.</p> <p>The learning will be presented to the Adult Safeguarding Board for wider dissemination.</p> <p>Equation will incorporate the content into their multi-agency training programme for both City and County partners.</p> <p>Additionally, the Slavery and Exploitation Team will receive the learning to integrate into their own training materials.</p>	<p>NCSP</p> <p>Equation</p>	November 2025		<p>06/08/2025</p> <p>Recruitment for a full-time Childrens and Adults Training Officer is underway, and the recruitment process has been undertaken. The Training Officer will be in post from 1st of September 2025.</p>	

	Recommendation	Rationale	Scope of Recommendation - Local or National	Action to Take	Lead Agency	Target Date	Date of Completion	Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation • Outcome Have there been key steps that have allowed the recommendation to be enacted? List the evidence for outcomes being achieved What does outcome look like? What is the overall change or improvement to be achieved by this recommendation?	RAG
4)	Agencies must evidence to Nottingham Community Safety Partnership that they are prompting and encouraging their professionals to be professionally curious, and Nottingham Community Safety Partnership must gain an improved understanding of how to support agencies with this practice.	Professionals needed to be 'curious' by asking questions and thereafter verifying information from alternative sources, as required to gain an effective understanding of the circumstances.	Local	<p>Professionals to bring together learning from previous DHR action plans and recommendations and reissue previous training and guidance. The existing 7-minute briefing on professional curiosity which will be reshared.</p> <p>Professionals to ensure that this learning is reinforced internally within their own organisations amongst their workforces.</p> <p>Professionals to use DHR Haiku as a case study to send out to reinforce the impact of not being 'professionally curious.'</p> <p>Professional Curiosity is an ongoing point of learning which has continued to be highlighted through multiple DHR's and will be escalated up into the NCSP Board as an ongoing concern. A request will be made to add to the risk register for ongoing monitoring.</p>	All	November 2025		<p>Highlighting good examples of professional curiosity could be included within quarterly monitoring shared by partners to the NCSP through the relevant strategy groups.</p> <p>This could also be discussed within management supervision sessions with staff and made a specific point for discussion.</p>	
5)	Nottingham Community safety Partnership in collaboration with the Slavery Exploitation Team must raise awareness of the Slavery Exploitation Team within partner agencies and support them to embed referrals into their guidance and processes.	Many professionals remain unaware of the Slavery Exploitation Team.	Local	<p>Extending the Reach of the Slavery and Exploitation Team (SET)</p> <p>SET will explore opportunities to broaden their engagement with additional organisations by incorporating key information into staff CPD</p>	Slavery and Exploitation Team	November 2025		<p>SET has already developed and delivered a bespoke training package to frontline police officers. This training will now be extended to the Police Development Hub for wider rollout.</p>	

	Recommendation	Rationale	Scope of Recommendation - Local or National	Action to Take	Lead Agency	Target Date	Date of Completion	Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation • Outcome <p>Have there been key steps that have allowed the recommendation to be enacted?</p> <p>List the evidence for outcomes being achieved What does outcome look like?</p> <p>What is the overall change or improvement to be achieved by this recommendation?</p>	RAG
				<p>(Continuing Professional Development) days. This will support increased awareness and understanding of their role across the sector.</p> <p>Relevant content can be included in a concise briefing slide, alongside learning points from other recommendations within this action plan.</p>					
6)	Nottinghamshire Police must review the criteria and use of their Place of Interest Markers in relation to repeat victims of crime and ensure that the updated criteria is implemented across the force and incorporated into training.	Marking Kiddo's address as a Place of Interest might have prompted a stronger response to later incidents.	Local	<p>Place of Interest (POI) Markers</p> <p>Nottinghamshire Police currently do not have a formal policy regarding the use of Place of Interest (POI) markers and do not consider their implementation beneficial at this time.</p> <p>The concern is that overuse in inappropriate cases may diminish their impact and effectiveness.</p> <p>The force will review the existing processes to ensure they are functioning as intended.</p> <p>Training on the use of POI markers has been delivered to frontline officers and will continue to be included in ongoing</p>	Nottinghamshire Police	August 2025			

	Recommendation	Rationale	Scope of Recommendation - Local or National	Action to Take	Lead Agency	Target Date	Date of Completion	Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation • Outcome Have there been key steps that have allowed the recommendation to be enacted? List the evidence for outcomes being achieved What does outcome look like? What is the overall change or improvement to be achieved by this recommendation?	RAG
				professional development.					
7)	Nottingham Community Safety Partnership in collaboration with partner agencies must learn from domestic abuse practice to develop and promote a robust straightforward multi-agency resource (which should include referral to the Slavery Exploitation Team and reference the work they do) which will support professionals from all agencies to respond to concerns of financial abuse and exploitation effectively. This resource must thereafter be integrated into agency safeguarding training and processes.	The challenges for professionals began with the complexity of exploitation work and lack of direct processes.	Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equation will incorporate relevant elements into their existing training programmes and update their website to include a link to the Slavery and Exploitation Team (SET). • SET will develop a comprehensive training package to be shared with all partner organisations. • Nottinghamshire Police currently deliver a three-slide presentation created by SET. This training is being rolled out to all new officers, including neighbourhood policing teams. • The presentation will be circulated to the ALIG group for further sharing within their respective organisations. • This information will also be included in a briefing slide, alongside other recommendations from the action plan, to 	NCSP Slavery and Exploitation Team Equation	November 2025		 Slavery Exploitation Team condensed.pptx	

	Recommendation	Rationale	Scope of Recommendation - Local or National	Action to Take	Lead Agency	Target Date	Date of Completion	Evidence: • Key milestones achieved in enacting recommendation • Outcome Have there been key steps that have allowed the recommendation to be enacted? List the evidence for outcomes being achieved What does outcome look like? What is the overall change or improvement to be achieved by this recommendation?	RAG
				support consistent messaging and awareness.					

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL



Interpersonal Abuse Unit
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

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

Rachel Street
Nottingham City Council
Loxley House
Station Street
Nottingham
NG2 3NG

15th January 2026

Dear Rachel,

Thank you for submitting the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) report (Kiddo) for Nottingham City Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to the Home Office Quality Assurance (QA) Board. The report was considered at the QA Board meeting on 3rd December 2025. 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 DHR may 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 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	Kiddo
COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP	Nottingham City
DATE REVIEWED BY QA BOARD	03 December 2025
DECISION	Publish with amendments
GOOD PRACTICE COMMENDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is good to see specialist input via services for older people on the panel. • Kiddo's family engaged in the DHR process and the Chair met with Kiddo's sister and his nephew, which was good practice. • The lived experience sections of the report are written with insight into how Kiddo is likely to have felt and are supported by evidence. • The professional challenges section offers a balanced understanding of the probation perspective. • The equality and diversity section is well considered. As well as an understanding of male victims of domestic abuse, there is broad consideration of factors relevant to survival sex and ways in which older victims of crime can be particularly vulnerable.
FEEDBACK FOR FUTURE DHRs	Please mark the documents as confidential until they have been through the quality assurance process.

	DHR SECTION	DHR QA BOARD FEEDBACK (improvements required before publication)
	Title Page	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please rephrase the title in both the overview report and executive summary so that it doesn't say 'deceased person'. • Please mark the documents as confidential.
1	Contents Page	No amendments required.
2	Pen Portrait	There is no pen portrait for Kiddo within the report. If possible, please consider including this.
3	Condolences	No amendments required.

4	Confidentiality and Anonymity	No amendments required.
5	Terms of Reference	Please consider clarifying whether Kiddo's family helped shape the terms of reference.
6	Equality and Diversity	Sex and gender reassignment should be referenced rather than using the term cisgender.
7	Background Information	At section 4.39, the report states that it is more appropriate in this case to refer to sex work as survival sex. However, the term sex work is then used in sections: 4.38, 6, 6.10.7, 8.30, 8.85, 10.3.
8	Combined Chronology	Please address the accuracy of the following statement in section 6.12.4: 'When Barbara was next released from prison, she was not eligible for Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements, but because she had been served an additional sentence for a shop theft whilst in prison, she was now subject to Post Sentence Supervision'. Please consider amending to: 'When Barbara was next released from prison, she was not automatically managed under Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements...'
9	Overview	No amendments required.
10	Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is very thorough but the detail that Barbara's benefits were paid into Kiddo's bank account is not picked up. Please could this be addressed. • The hyperlink in section 8.3, footer 33: 'Voice of women on Probation' does not work. • Section 8.15 states, 'The reason why enforcement action wasn't taken has been discussed by the professionals engaging with this review and it has been concluded that it could potentially have been because Barbara was still waiting for her initial appointment with drug support services (following the referral made by Probation Services after she had failed her first test)'. From this description, it is a suggestion rather than a conclusion. • At section 8.15, the final sentence has a typo which makes the closing point unclear. Please consider removing the word had: 'and given that a link between substance misuse and offending behaviour had already been identified, consideration had as to whether the risks were escalating to a point where they could no longer be managed in the community.' • In section 8.41, the implication of frustration is understandable, however, it may be better to use 'very likely to' rather than 'clearly recognised' in: 'had any professional convened a meeting, agencies would have clearly recognised that Barbara...'
11	Conclusions	The detail above might have been relevant to how systems may have aided Barbara's abuse. Please consider including.
12	Lessons learnt and recommendations	In relation to the above please consider a recommendation in relation to benefits being paid into the account of someone else. An important theme of this review is the read-across between exploitation and domestic abuse. A recommendation like this would benefit the response to both issues.

13	Timescales	No amendments required.
14	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please add a dissemination list that includes the family, the local Police and Crime Commissioner and the Domestic Abuse Commissioner. • Please clarify if any consideration been given to key dates on which to avoid publication and family support if needed. • It states that only the executive summary will be published. This section states that action plan will be shared with partner agencies. Please consider sharing the full report or providing reasoning for not doing this.
21	Action Plan	No amendments required.
22	<p>Has there been a request to withhold publication?</p> <p><i>If Yes, include the reason for the request. Is it proportionate and appropriate?</i></p>	No requests to withhold publication. However as above the QA Board notes that the report suggests only the executive summary will be published. If this is the case, please clarify the reasons for withholding the publication of the full report.
23	Any other comments	No amendments required.