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# Background

<Provide any relevant background information, including:

* Current delivery phase and any key decision point/stage gate supported by the review.
* Current project/programme status, including any areas of concern identified by the SRO or other key stakeholders.>

# Objectives

<Clearly state the objectives of the review. Ensure that they are focused, unambiguous and pertinent to the current delivery phase. For example:

* Are the objectives framed around specific risks and how will the review assesses the impact of these risks on the expected outcomes?
* What areas of concern have been raised by the SRO and other key stakeholders and how will these be answered by the review?>

# Scope

<Clearly state what areas are within the scope of the review and what areas are deemed to be out of scope. Any areas out of scope should be caveated by a statement that allows the Lead Reviewer to investigate any areas identified during the course of the review that may impact on successful delivery of the expected outcomes.>

#  Approach

<Describe the approach to the review, including any relevant methodologies that will be applied to the review.>

# Review team

<Describe the skills and experience of the Lead Reviewer and/or review team relevant to the review. For example, do they have experience in the delivery methodology?>

# Deliverables

<Clearly state the deliverables from the review. For example:

* Is the factual accuracy checking process clearly described?
* How will delivery confidence be assessed and recommendations prioritised? If you don’t have your own rating system, refer to the GCDO’s Report Rating System for guidance.
* Who will receive copies of the final report? For high risk investments, assurance reports should be submitted to the GCDO for a quality review.>

# Timetable

<State the key dates for the review, including:

* Start/end dates date for fieldwork
* Draft assurance report issued (within five business days of fieldwork being completed)
* Management responses (within ten business days of the agency receiving the draft assurance report)
* Final assurance report issued (within five business days of management responses being received from the agency.>

# Estimated charges

<Provide a breakdown of the estimated charges, including the planned number of hours for each review team member. As a minimum, this must include the Lead Reviewer and any other named resources.

Any assumptions used in arriving at the estimated charges must be clearly stated.>

# Conflicts of interest

<Any conflicts of interest and how they are to be managed should be clearly stated.

All parties need to be aware of potential conflicts of interest both real and perceived. Independence and objectivity are critical to the delivery of assurance services to provide robust challenge. Examples of conflicts of interest include:

* Personal relationships between agency and provider personnel.
* Performing an assurance review where the provider has or is currently providing project management or technical services
* Fixing issues identified during the course of an assurance review.>