Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

GExperts Learning Academy | EX-X20 | EX | 2-3 days

Course overview

2-3 days EX programme focused on Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Designed for: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships.
- Interpret an applied case using evidence and stated assumptions.
- Identify risks, safeguards, role boundaries and escalation points.
- Prepare a clear recommendation for a multidisciplinary audience.

Course guide

Work through each module objective, lesson and teaching note, complete the applied activity and assessment, then use the separate Academy practice page for practice questions and answer feedback.

Separate practice questions:
https://www.globalexpertsconsultoria.com/training/academy/courses/questions/?course=EX-X20

Academic and certification status

Draft learning resource for study and review. It does not confer accreditation, external certification, a regulated qualification, professional licence, safety-critical competence or site authorisation. Confirm approvals, current laws, standards, approved procedures and awarding-body requirements before delivery.

Module 1: Contract negotiation simulation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract negotiation simulation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract negotiation simulation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Negotiation preparation identifies objectives, alternatives, authority and acceptable tradeoffs. Separate positions from underlying interests. Technical and fiscal terms interact with schedule, investment and risk; avoid negotiating a headline number in isolation.

Decision logic. Use a mandate sheet and issue log. Teams cannot commit outside delegated authority. Explore package trades, test downside consequences and record unresolved points before drafting. This role-play creates no actual offer, agreement or legal advice.

Worked example. The fictional state team values training commitments while an investor values schedule certainty; both need measurable and feasible terms.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Run a three-round negotiation and submit an unsigned term sheet plus risk commentary.

Model answer guide. Credit quantified commitments, authority checks, alternatives, clear conditions and documented unresolved issues.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Run a three-round negotiation and submit an unsigned term sheet plus risk commentary.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 2: Contract strategy and risk allocation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract strategy and risk allocation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract strategy and risk allocation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contracts define scope, deliverables, payment, acceptance, change and remedies. Lump sum, reimbursable and target-cost arrangements allocate uncertainty differently. Begin with scope maturity and market capability rather than choosing a familiar contract label.

Decision logic. Risk should be allocated to parties able to manage it, with realistic pricing and assurance. Unclear interfaces create disputes despite detailed clauses. Actual indemnity, liability, insurance and governing-law terms require qualified legal and commercial review.

Worked example. A supplier prices an undefined offshore interface as an exclusion; the owner's total risk remains unresolved.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

Model answer guide. Include deliverables, acceptance evidence, owner interfaces, change control and exclusions.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 3: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Systems and Int

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. Learners connect the principles to asset performance, people, operational risk, project value and local context.

Decision logic. Review the objective, evidence, limits, interfaces and applicable controls for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces. Decisions require current information, role-appropriate authority, competent review and documented assumptions.

Worked example. Use an applied Namibia-relevant case in which a team plans executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces while balancing safety, integrity, schedule, cost, environmental protection and local capability.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Model answer guide. A sound response defines scope; uses current, traceable evidence; applies approved requirements and controls; records assumptions; assigns competent owners; checks interfaces; and communicates a measurable decision with an escalation path.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 4: Dispute prevention and resolution

Learning objectives

- Explain dispute prevention and resolution, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Dispute prevention and resolution
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Disputes often begin with ambiguity, undocumented change or inconsistent expectations. Teach contemporaneous records, issue escalation and contractual notice awareness. Separate technical disagreement from entitlement and relationship management.

Decision logic. Map negotiation, mediation, expert determination, arbitration or litigation only as options governed by actual agreements and law. Protect privileged or sensitive information and obtain legal advice where needed. Never invent notice periods or enforceability claims.

Worked example. A contractor requests extra payment for changed access conditions but the instructions and impact records are incomplete.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Assemble an issue chronology and identify evidence gaps.

Model answer guide. Separate established facts, disputed facts, contract questions and commercial options.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Assemble an issue chronology and identify evidence gaps.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 5: Stakeholder engagement and communication

Learning objectives

- Explain stakeholder engagement and communication, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Stakeholder engagement and communication
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Stakeholders can affect or be affected by a project. Analyse interests, influence, exposure and communication needs. Consultation is a continuing process, not simply sending information. Include groups with high impact exposure but limited formal power.

Decision logic. Choose accessible channels and record concerns, responses and decisions. Avoid assuming silence equals consent. Communication plans should define purpose, owner, timing, feedback and confidentiality. Actual commitments need delegated authority.

Worked example. A fictional port project consults officials but overlooks fishers whose access may change.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Develop an engagement plan and grievance-response route.

Model answer guide. Include affected groups, accessible formats, response tracking and boundaries on commitments.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Develop an engagement plan and grievance-response route.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 6: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Data and Perfor

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. Learners connect the principles to asset performance, people, operational risk, project value and local context.

Decision logic. Review the objective, evidence, limits, interfaces and applicable controls for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance. Decisions require current information, role-appropriate authority, competent review and documented assumptions.

Worked example. Use an applied Namibia-relevant case in which a team plans executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance while balancing safety, integrity, schedule, cost, environmental protection and local capability.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Model answer guide. A sound response defines scope; uses current, traceable evidence; applies approved requirements and controls; records assumptions; assigns competent owners; checks interfaces; and communicates a measurable decision with an escalation path.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 7: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Applied Case describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. Learners connect the principles to asset performance, people, operational risk, project value and local context.

Decision logic. Review the objective, evidence, limits, interfaces and applicable controls for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case. Decisions require current information, role-appropriate authority, competent review and documented assumptions.

Worked example. Use an applied Namibia-relevant case in which a team plans executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case while balancing safety, integrity, schedule, cost, environmental protection and local capability.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Model answer guide. A sound response defines scope; uses current, traceable evidence; applies approved requirements and controls; records assumptions; assigns competent owners; checks interfaces; and communicates a measurable decision with an escalation path.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 8: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Communication

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. Learners connect the principles to asset performance, people, operational risk, project value and local context.

Decision logic. Review the objective, evidence, limits, interfaces and applicable controls for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation. Decisions require current information, role-appropriate authority, competent review and documented assumptions.

Worked example. Use an applied Namibia-relevant case in which a team plans executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation while balancing safety, integrity, schedule, cost, environmental protection and local capability.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Model answer guide. A sound response defines scope; uses current, traceable evidence; applies approved requirements and controls; records assumptions; assigns competent owners; checks interfaces; and communicates a measurable decision with an escalation path.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 9: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Knowledge Chec

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. Learners connect the principles to asset performance, people, operational risk, project value and local context.

Decision logic. Review the objective, evidence, limits, interfaces and applicable controls for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check. Decisions require current information, role-appropriate authority, competent review and documented assumptions.

Worked example. Use an applied Namibia-relevant case in which a team plans executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check while balancing safety, integrity, schedule, cost, environmental protection and local capability.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Model answer guide. A sound response defines scope; uses current, traceable evidence; applies approved requirements and controls; records assumptions; assigns competent owners; checks interfaces; and communicates a measurable decision with an escalation path.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 10: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Competence Re

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Competence Review describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. Learners connect the principles to asset performance, people, operational risk, project value and local context.

Decision logic. Review the objective, evidence, limits, interfaces and applicable controls for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review. Decisions require current information, role-appropriate authority, competent review and documented assumptions.

Worked example. Use an applied Namibia-relevant case in which a team plans executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review while balancing safety, integrity, schedule, cost, environmental protection and local capability.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Model answer guide. A sound response defines scope; uses current, traceable evidence; applies approved requirements and controls; records assumptions; assigns competent owners; checks interfaces; and communicates a measurable decision with an escalation path.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Facilitator close-out and resources

Facilitator close-out

Record attendance, assessment evidence, learner support needs, incidents and improvement actions according to approved provider processes. Do not sign learners off for regulated or safety-critical work without the authorised assessment and certification route.

Resources and references

- Supplied GExperts/IUM reference materials; verify reuse rights and currentness.
- Current applicable Namibian legislation, standards and approved site procedures supplied by the provider.
- Case worksheet and instructor slides must be produced and reviewed before course release.