Well Integrity and Intervention Management

GExperts Learning Academy | PC-X06 | PC | 12-18 weeks

Course overview

12-18 weeks PC programme focused on Well Integrity and Intervention Management, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Designed for: Experienced professionals

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Well Integrity and Intervention Management.
- 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=PC-X06

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: Well control and barrier management

Learning objectives

- Explain well control and barrier management, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Well control and barrier management
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A barrier system prevents unintended fluid flow. Show primary and secondary barrier envelopes and the need for defined performance standards. Recognising indications, reporting promptly and following the authorised well-control programme are distinct from being certified to operate equipment.

Decision logic. Teach barrier status with evidence, not equipment names alone. An installed component may be unavailable, untested or outside its operating envelope. Barrier changes require controlled review. No live well-control drill or shut-in sequence is prescribed by this awareness content.

Worked example. A component appears on the drawing, but its required test record is missing. Treat its verified availability as 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. Construct a barrier-status register from a fictional well diagram.

Model answer guide. Record function, verification, owner, limitation and escalation; do not mark an unverified barrier healthy.

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

Applied activity

Construct a barrier-status register from a fictional well diagram.

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: Well architecture and drilling systems

Learning objectives

- Explain well architecture and drilling systems, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Well architecture and drilling systems
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A well connects the reservoir to the surface through a designed sequence of hole sections, casing and barriers. Explain measured depth versus true vertical depth, wellhead functions and interfaces with rig, marine riser and subsea equipment.

Decision logic. Well design starts with reservoir objectives, pressures, temperature, hazards and data uncertainty. Casing depth and equipment ratings require engineering calculations and independent review. This course uses diagrams and educational calculations, never an executable drilling programme.

Worked example. A deviated well has greater measured depth than vertical depth; fluid hydrostatic head relates to vertical depth.

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. Label a fictional well schematic and list five missing design inputs.

Model answer guide. Include pore pressure, fracture limits, temperature, geology and service conditions; distinguish equipment identification from design approval.

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

Applied activity

Label a fictional well schematic and list five missing design inputs.

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: Casing and cementing

Learning objectives

- Explain casing and cementing, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Casing and cementing
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Casing supports the borehole and isolates formations; cement contributes to zonal isolation and structural support. Explain shoe, annulus, centralisation and displacement using a cutaway diagram. Distinguish design intent from evidence that a barrier has actually been established.

Decision logic. Assess cement placement uncertainty, contamination, losses and verification data together. Pressure tests and logs answer different questions and must be interpreted within an approved programme. Do not provide generic acceptance pressures or operational instructions that override site procedures.

Worked example. A calculated cement volume matches the plan, but returns indicate possible losses. Volume pumped alone cannot confirm isolation.

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. Review a fictional cementing quality dossier and identify acceptance evidence gaps.

Model answer guide. Require reconciled volumes, operational observations and appropriate verification reviewed by authorised engineers.

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

Applied activity

Review a fictional cementing quality dossier and identify acceptance 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 4: Well Integrity and Intervention Management: Evidence and Decisio

Learning objectives

- Explain well integrity and intervention management: evidence and decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Well Integrity and Intervention Management: Evidence and Decision Gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Well Integrity and Intervention Management: Evidence and Decision Gates describes a practical part of Well Integrity and Intervention Management. 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 well integrity and intervention management: evidence and decision gates. 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 well integrity and intervention management: evidence and decision gates 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 well integrity and intervention management: evidence and decision gates: 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 well integrity and intervention management: evidence and decision gates: 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 5: Well testing and pressure interpretation

Learning objectives

- Explain well testing and pressure interpretation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Well testing and pressure interpretation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A well test records flow and pressure response to infer reservoir and well behaviour. Explain drawdown, buildup, skin and boundary effects conceptually. Measurement resolution, rate history and test duration constrain interpretation.

Decision logic. Different models can fit limited data. Use derivative behaviour and independent geology to test models rather than declaring a unique answer. Short tests may not observe distant boundaries. Operational testing requires an approved programme and safety controls.

Worked example. A short buildup appears stable but has not investigated the reservoir boundary; connectivity remains uncertain.

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. Review a fictional test summary and list claims supported and unsupported by it.

Model answer guide. Separate local mobility evidence from field-wide connectivity and long-term deliverability claims.

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

Applied activity

Review a fictional test summary and list claims supported and unsupported by it.

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: Risk assessment and uncertainty management

Learning objectives

- Explain risk assessment and uncertainty management, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Risk assessment and uncertainty management
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Define the activity and potential harm, identify hazards, evaluate existing controls, then decide further controls and ownership. A risk matrix supports prioritisation but does not prove a risk is tolerable. Include affected people and changing conditions.

Decision logic. Test whether controls are present and effective. Residual risk should be reassessed after control implementation, not merely after a promise. Escalate high-consequence uncertainty for competent review. Project risk also includes schedule, cost and opportunity effects.

Worked example. A permit lists a barrier that has not yet been installed. The claimed residual risk is premature.

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. Complete a risk register with cause, event, consequence, control, owner and verification.

Model answer guide. Keep hazard and consequence distinct and require evidence before taking control credit.

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

Applied activity

Complete a risk register with cause, event, consequence, control, owner and verification.

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: Corrosion mechanisms and damage management

Learning objectives

- Explain corrosion mechanisms and damage management, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Corrosion mechanisms and damage management
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Corrosion depends on materials, fluids, temperature, environment and operating history. Internal corrosion, external marine corrosion and localised attack can require different controls. Explain general thinning versus pitting and why average thickness may hide local damage.

Decision logic. Identify credible damage mechanisms before selecting inspection or mitigation. Coatings, inhibitors, material selection and cathodic protection have different applications. Competent engineers establish acceptance criteria; classroom measurements never approve equipment for continued service.

Worked example. A plate's average thickness appears acceptable but a local pit is much deeper.

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. Review a fictional damage map and propose a specialist inspection scope.

Model answer guide. Address local severity, mechanism, inspection coverage and operating conditions rather than average thickness alone.

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

Applied activity

Review a fictional damage map and propose a specialist inspection scope.

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: Well Integrity and Intervention Management: Communication and E

Learning objectives

- Explain well integrity and intervention management: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Well Integrity and Intervention Management: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Well Integrity and Intervention Management: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Well Integrity and Intervention Management. 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 well integrity and intervention management: 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 well integrity and intervention management: 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 well integrity and intervention management: 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 well integrity and intervention management: 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: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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 responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Applied activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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: Well Integrity and Intervention Management: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain well integrity and intervention management: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Well Integrity and Intervention Management: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Well Integrity and Intervention Management

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Well Integrity and Intervention Management: Competence Review describes a practical part of Well Integrity and Intervention Management. 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 well integrity and intervention management: 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 well integrity and intervention management: 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 well integrity and intervention management: 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 well integrity and intervention management: 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.